

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 708

PS 009 855

AUTHOR Bikales, Gerda
TITLE Day Care: A Program in Search of a Policy.
INSTITUTION Center for Analysis of Public Issues, Princeton, N.J.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 129p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Analysis of Public Issues, 16 Vandeventer Avenue, Princeton, New Jersey 08540 (\$5.00, plus \$0.70 shipping)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Child Care; Cost Effectiveness; *Day Care Programs; *Day Care Services; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Policy; *Evaluation; *Financial Policy; Government Role; Historical Reviews; Organization; Program Administration; Program Descriptions; *Public Policy
IDENTIFIERS New Jersey

ABSTRACT

This report examines current issues relating to day care and challenges many of the policy assumptions that underlie a major public program of subsidized day care for children. A historical perspective of day care is presented and various types of day care are described. The costs and benefits of day care are examined and the relation of day care to women's liberation is discussed. New Jersey's organization and administration of day care services is examined in detail. Based on the information reviewed in the report, it was recommended that day care programs: (1) should not be universal, (2) should be limited to sound custodial care rather than "schools for toddlers," (3) should include only funds for sound custodial care of children with financing for public health, educational, and social services coming from other programs designed for those purposes, (4) should be subsidized through vouchers rather than direct subsidies to program operators, (5) should use day care subsidies where they are likely to have the most beneficial impact upon families and upon society at large, and (6) should give top priority to expansion of after-school day care, should de-emphasize preschool day care and should provide infant day care only in special circumstances. (JMB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED153708

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

DAY CARE

A Program in Search of a Policy

*A Report by
The Center for
Analysis of Public Issues*

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFORM ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Susan Saeger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM.

BY GERDA BIKALES *
EDITED BY JOHN KOLESAR
The Center for Analysis of Public Issues
Princeton NJ

PS 009855

Foreword

In this report the Center for Analysis of Public Issues challenges some of the policy assumptions that underlie a major public program — subsidized day care for children. This has not been a usual pattern in the dozen or so reports previously published by the Center. It has been the Center's practice to base its reports on some widely accepted foundations of policy — the Constitution or law or a code of ethics, usually. But in the case of day care, it was the very absence of a coherent policy which we found to be the central issue.

Because policy is our major concern, this report has a somewhat different tone than the earlier reports. Instead of describing bad administration, waste and villainy, we analyze and challenge half-baked concepts, we point out the consequences of programs based on little more than good intentions, and we search for some standards to guide policy. This is not to say that day care programs do not have problems with wasteful and even dishonest administration. But such problems pale into insignificance when placed alongside the costs of deformed and deficient policies.

The report was written and its research supervised by Ms. Gerda Bikales, M.S.W., A.C.S.W. In addition to experience as a writer, Ms. Bikales has done inner-city casework for the Essex County Welfare Board and at the Child Development Clinic, United Hospitals, Newark, N.J. She was assisted in her research by Ms. Anjali Ghate, a cultural anthropologist. Ms. Ann McDade of the Women's Center at Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison, N.J., helped with the task of visiting day care centers in New Jersey. The study was conducted under the general supervision of John Kolesar, the director of the Center for Analysis of Public Issues until September 1976.

The Center is, of course, indebted to the many people involved in the day care field who helped us with information and interviews. We would also like to thank the people who helped prepare the manuscript for publication. Don DeMaio lent impetus to the report from its inception and was in charge of the first phase; Nancy Merriett had a major hand in layout; Arlene Sinding typeset the manuscript; Maura Mullaney, an intern here, helped proofread. Above all, we are grateful for the financial support from the John and Florence Schumann Foundation of Montclair, N.J., which made this report possible. The analysis and judgments contained in the report, however, are those of the study team.

The Center for Analysis of Public Issues
16 Vandeventer Avenue
Princeton, N.J. 08540

Copyright 1978 by The Center for Analysis of Public Issues, Princeton, NJ 08540.
All rights reserved.

Library of Congress number 78-50746

CONTENTS

Introduction

1. How We Got There: A Historical Perspective	5
2. The Varieties of Day Care	17
3. The Years Before Kindergarten	40
4. The Costs of Day Care	49
5. The Benefits of Day Care: Myth and Reality	61
6. Day Care and the Liberation of Women	80
7. Day Care in New Jersey	88
8. Within Reason: A Policy for Day Care Programs	116

INTRODUCTION

"God couldn't be everywhere, so he created mothers"

Jewish Proverb

Remember "momism"?

Writer Philip Wylie did quite a job on Mom in the 1940s. For a generation of Americans, "momism" stood as a pejorative for the ever-present, all-controlling mother who dominated the American family, to the detriment of her overprotected brood. The word eventually made its way into Webster's International Dictionary and became part of our catalog of psychopathologies.

Today, momism seems an archaic concern. In part, *Portnoy's Complaint* is comical because it is old-fashioned. Overprotection has faded into the realm of private psychoanalytic probings of middle-aged psyches. It has been replaced in public discussion by a growing alarm over widespread parental indifference, neglect and outright abuse, and over the disappearance of parents from the lives of young children.

The vanishing father has long been a character upon our national scene. In folklore, we find him as an adventurous spirit in the great immigration waves, arriving without family burdens to these shores and jolly-well taking his time about sending for the wife and kids in the old country. We know him as the roguish seducer who loves them and leaves them when the going gets tough, and as the young man who falls an early victim to the vicissitudes of living, leaving behind a bereaved widow and pathetic little orphans. In the post-World War II era, he was the Man in the Grey Flannel Suit, a suburban commuter to the big city, where he relentlessly pursued the American dream of material success, returning home late in the evening, briefcase in hand for another round of work. His weekends at home were hardly more relaxed, and often were devoted to social activities that enhanced his career.

During the War on Poverty, the father missing from so many of the nation's black homes occupied the spotlight in the writings of the influential social planners, most prominently in the works of Daniel P. Moynihan. The father's unavailability was cited as the cause of many of the social ills plaguing the country's disadvantaged groups, and loomed large in the social engineering experiments that mark the period.

Nowadays the condition of fatherless-ness is no longer attributed only to the poor; it is rapidly becoming a common experience for children of white, middle-class and affluent families. For despite the dramatic drop in the over-all birth rate, out-of-wedlock births have continued to climb, thus creating ever-larger groups of children who are fatherless by standard definition. In New Jersey, these births in 1975 accounted for 15.2 per cent of the total number, up from 14.7 per cent in 1974 and 10.9 per cent in 1973. In some cities, more than forty per cent of children are now being born to unmarried women and girls. Much of this increase is due to an epidemic of pregnancies among teen-aged girls, which in 1974 represented one-half of all the illegitimate births in the state. National statistics indicate that illegitimacy is now making significant inroads into the lives of white families, often of middle-class standing.¹ In 1974, more than 200,000 out-of-wedlock babies were born to teen-aged mothers in this country, 85,000 of them white.

Still, the leading factor in removing the father from the American home has been the soaring divorce rate. Between 1965 and 1975, divorces have more than doubled, going from 479,000 to well over a million a year. In addition, countless thousands of families break apart without legal formalities every year. According to recent U.S. Census data, more than eleven million of our sixty-six million youngsters under eighteen live in single-parent families. Among the children born in this decade, it is anticipated that at least two of every five will spend five years or more with only one parent.

While the departure of the father from the American family has long been lamented, the realization is growing that mothers too are increasingly unavailable to their children. Women have been joining the labor force in record numbers. Since 1947, when 16.6 million women were at work, their participation has increased at an accelerating rate to 37.1 million in 1975.² For New Jersey, the most up-to-date information available is in the 1970 census. Keeping in mind that the figures are surely much higher now, we learn from that source that 1.1 million women were actively employed in the state that year; this represents 42.5 per cent of all women over the age of sixteen (we use the word "employed" for women in the traditional though inaccurate sense that excludes the housewife).

Included in this work force are many mothers of young children. Nationally, 4.8 million mothers who collectively have responsibility for six million children under the age of six are at work. This represents one-third of all such mothers, and affects one-third of all pre-school children in the nation. Again, citing the New Jersey statistics from the 1970 census, we know that in this state a quarter of the mothers with pre-school children are employed, and for mothers of school-age children the employment rate is 50 per cent.

There are other major claims on the time and energies of today's young mothers. Many are enrolled in a wide range of educational programs, from high school completion and federally sponsored manpower training programs to graduate university studies, which also leave thousands of children without maternal supervision.

The working mother is not necessarily a single parent, although this is often the case. As seen in Table 1, which details the work participation of New Jersey women by marital status, race and age of children, married women living with their husbands are on the job in significant numbers. Economic necessity is frequently the crucial factor in a woman's decision to seek employment, as shown by the higher participation of black women and of those without another breadwinner in the home. But increasingly, the work world holds out other attractions to women in search of fulfillment who reject full-time homemaking and child care as a life-style even in homes with an employed father.

TABLE 1*
Work Participation of Mothers in New Jersey,
by Marital Status, Race and Age of Children

Marital Status	Working with children under 6 at home			Working with children 6 to 17 at home		
	Total	White	Black	Total	White	Black
Married, living with husband at home	21.7	19.1	46.4	47.2	46.2	60.9
"Other" No husband in household	43.7	46.9	40.2	67.0	69.7	60.3
Total: Married and "other"	24.1	20.9	44.1	49.8	48.6	60.7

* Figures shown in percentages

When we further consider that today's household unit rarely includes a doting grandmother or a helpful maiden aunt, that in fact there are no other adults around with kinship or moral obligations to help the family, the urgent question presents itself: who is to take care of all these youngsters while their mothers are at work or in school?

The answer that has evolved through a historical process that we shall trace is publicly subsidized day care. In New Jersey, the director of the state's child welfare agency testified at a legislative hearing in February 1975 that 33,396 children would receive some form of day care through the auspices of his agency in the current fiscal year. Additional full and part-time day care is also available through other public sponsorship, such as Head Start. Paraphrasing the Jewish proverb, it would appear that because mothers can't be everywhere, Uncle Sam created day care centers.

DAY CARE

Notes -- Introduction

¹See, for example, Leslie Aldridge Westoff, "Kids with Kids," *The New York Times Magazine*, February 22, 1976.

²A.H. Raskin, "The Changing Face of Labor," *The New York Times*, February 15, 1976.

How We Got There: A Historical Perspective

"... one area of deep concern to this Administration has to do with the most dependent constituency of all: the child under five. I have announced a commitment to the first five years of life as one of the basic pledges of this Administration."

President Richard M. Nixon, Message to Congress, April 24, 1969

"... all other factors being equal, good public policy requires that we enhance rather than diminish both parental authority and parental involvement with children... for the Federal government to plunge headlong financially into supporting child development would commit the vast moral authority of the National Government to the side of communal approaches to child rearing over against the family-centered approach."

President Richard M. Nixon, in veto message of the Comprehensive Child Development Act, December 10, 1971

PRESIDENT NIXON WAS by no means the only American who ever had strong but sometimes conflicting feelings about day care, or "comprehensive child development," as the current catch-phrase goes. Nixon's wavering attitudes reflect

the concerns expressed throughout the 150 years' history of organized day care in this country. These have been various mixtures of solicitude for the neglected child, skepticism about the mother's motives, pragmatism in the face of prevailing financial realities, utopian dreams, and anxiety over the potential harm to family relationships and the mental health of children. Our national ambivalence on this subject is epitomized by the fact that our subsidized full-day child care centers are filled with children from families receiving public assistance under Aid for Dependent Children - a program established in 1935 precisely to avoid driving single-parent mothers of young children into the labor force, and allowing them instead to stay at home and care for their offspring.

History has no record of organized group child care in the nation's colonial and post-revolutionary periods. It is a safe guess that there was little need for such a service as long as we were an agricultural people whose work in the fields, in the barn and in the cottage allowed children to grow up under the close supervision of their parents. Even in the event of a parent's death, the orphan was usually reared by other adults in the family and in the close-knit community of those days.

Not unexpectedly, we find the first day nursery we know of in a city - the Boston Infant School, established around 1828. New York City, which was to assume a leadership position in the American day care movement, had at least one such program functioning by 1854, The Nursery for the Children of the Poor, sponsored by a hospital for the benefit of discharged patients. Naturally, it put a great emphasis on the hygiene of its charges, who ranged in age from six weeks to six years and who were cared for by nurses in groups of twelve children. Other child care centers sprang up during the Civil War, to help war widows and those women working in wartime factories. In the post-Civil War era, day nurseries took hold in many cities, and in 1893 a drop-in nursery received wide public attention by caring for some ten thousand children of visitors to the Chicago World's Fair. Five years later, enough centers were operating to warrant the formation of the National Federation of Day Nurseries, the first of the many advocacy and coordinating bodies in existence today.

In the last quarter of the 19th and the early decades of the 20th centuries, waves of immigrants poured into the cities. Mostly from peasant and small-town societies, these newcomers were ill-prepared for life in the cities' crowded tenements. The Golden Land of their dreams held a rude awakening of grueling poverty. Though we have come to romanticize the drama of the life and times of these colorful immigrant communities, the social historians of the period have left us with other images too. Unshackled from the restraining influences that had guided them in the old country, not all of the new arrivals devoted themselves to hard work and self-sacrifice. Debauchery of every sort flourished, and took its toll in the quality of family life, already weakened by the dislocations of immigration. The exploitive industrial wages paid to these "greenhorn" breadwinners often made it necessary for mothers to seek employment as domestics or factory workers, with the result that little children were left without adequate care for long hours.

While the barons of industry took advantage of the immigrant work force, some of their wives and daughters were touched by the plight of the workers' children left alone at home. Having the money and time to devote to worthy causes, they became interested in philanthropic endeavors. They are remembered today as the founding "mothers" of numerous day-nurseries, some of which are still in existence. The purpose of these facilities was perfectly unambiguous: to provide some minimum of protection and physical care for youngsters whose mothers were forced to go to work. Mothers were helped to find work, not infrequently in the domestic employ of a center benefactress. The personnel placed in charge of these children were few in number and regularly worked about twelve hours a day. They were responsible for meal preparation and housekeeping as well as for the upbringing of the children. These day nurseries were devoted entirely to custodial care; there was no conscious effort to educate the children or to promote any particular program of social development.

Meanwhile, the nation was responding to newly introduced ideas about the educational and social needs of the preschool child. German immigrants had brought with them the concept of the *kindergarten*, pioneered by Friedrich Froebel, and opened a class for German-speaking children in 1855, in Watertown, Wisconsin. In 1860, Boston became the first American city to host a kindergarten, for English-speaking children. The Boston school became a training ground for teachers who quickly disseminated the new theories and established other schools. Before long, specialized education for the very young was promoted for three and four-year-olds; nursery schools, emphasizing the importance of appropriate play and socialization, gained acceptance everywhere. This pedagogy also penetrated the day nurseries, which retained their custodial focus but now attempted to incorporate some of the new learning into the daily routine.

The day nurseries also came to the attention of social reformers - a relationship that was to endure. Settlement houses in the big cities ran centers which consciously tried to assimilate their charges by serving as the bridge between the alien culture of their immigrant homes and the public school that awaited them. Social work-oriented, the settlement houses reached out to the mothers, to whom they tried to teach English and home management, to the older children for whom they organized after-school programs, and even to the fathers who were not permitted to ignore sanguine self-improvement schemes.

Most centers required parents to contribute a fee toward the cost of operations, and tapped private philanthropy for the rest. Then as now, the flow of charity tended to be less than fully reliable, and it was inevitable that governments would sooner or later become involved with day care. By 1901, the State of Maryland was contributing \$3,000 for center care in the City of Baltimore. In a different context of government responsibility, the State of California enacted - and presumably enforced - a form of state licensing for day care providers in 1917.

After World War I day care nurseries went into a period of public disfavor and decline. On the other hand, nursery schools became a national vogue and a standard educational prescription for upper-class children. Child-development courses proliferated on the college campus, and research centers specializing in the study of the very young opened at universities across the land.

Uncle Sam's entry into the day care business was precipitated by the Depression of the 1930's. Facilities were spawned under the auspices of the W.P.A. (Works Progress Administration) as a mechanism to create jobs for teachers, social workers, dietitians, etc. Since unemployment was pervasive, there was no rationalization that the centers would free mothers for work. Instead, it was assumed that the program would benefit the children of poor and disadvantaged families on its own merits, whether the mother was at home or not. By 1934, some 3,000 pre-kindergarten programs were operating, serving 65,000 children, and employing 7,500 teachers.¹

Government participation intensified during World War II, when Congress passed the Lanham Act to provide funds for day care centers in war-impacted areas. As men marched off to war, women were recruited to work in industry. Among the industry-related centers, those operated for the children of employees of the Kaiser Shipbuilding yards in Portland, Oregon, are a historic example of the ultimate in day care services - open twenty-four hours a day to cover three shifts, they also provided busy mothers with prepared take-home meals for the entire family. The Lanham program cost the federal government \$52 million, which was matched by a \$26 million contribution from the states. The funds went to 3,100 centers, caring for over 600,000 youngsters.

When the men returned victorious from World War II, it was assumed that the mothers would quietly return to their traditional pursuits. Almost everywhere the centers closed their doors. An exception was the State of California, where local school boards were encouraged to continue the centers with two-thirds support from the state. Another exception was New York City. Though that city had been ineligible for Lanham Act funding because it was not considered a war-impacted area, the W.P.A. centers continued operating there through the early 1940s. At that time, under pressure from various advocacy groups, plans were formulated for the continuation of these centers with money raised through equal contributions from parents, the city, and the state. Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia was uneasy about setting up a permanent, tax-supported program that would remove mothers from the home, and transferred the administration of the centers from the Board of Education to the city's Department of Public Welfare. The expectation was that day care enrollment would no longer be a routine affair but would now become a social welfare decision based on the merits of each case. LaGuardia also sought to avoid a direct government role in running the centers. He left their operation to private, non-profit agencies. After the war, the State of New York withdrew all of its support for day care operations. Well-organized, well-placed and well-intentioned supporters of day care were able to persuade the city to take over the state's share. In this way, New York - alone among cities - began a heavy financial commitment to the support of day care programs.

The 1960's witnessed a revival of interest in the world of the young child. A group of investigators who became known as "cognitive psychologists" - among them, Benjamin Bloom and J. McVicker Hunt - pointed to the primacy of very early childhood experiences in shaping the individual's future adaptational abilities. Kindergarten, they argued, is already too late to start the education of the children of poor and culturally deprived families. Intervention, in the form of supplemental enriching experiences, regular medical and dental care, and better nutrition, must be started much earlier for these children, so that they can get a head start on their middle-class schoolmates against whom they are ultimately measured.

The Head Start concept became a cornerstone of President Lyndon B. Johnson's Great Society reforms. In keeping with the prevailing spirit of the times, parent-involvement and grass-roots community control were to be built into the federally financed programs. The first Head Start classes were launched with much fanfare and little advance preparation in the summer of 1965. More than half a million children nearing kindergarten entry were enrolled in great haste in 13,400 centers across the land. Of all the projects of the War on Poverty, none enjoyed a wider consensus of approval, nor a bigger investment of national hope. At last, we were led to believe, we had found the real answer to the tormenting problems of self-perpetuating poverty. In the words of one commentator, it was "the country's biggest peace time mobilization of human resources and efforts."²

Initially, Head Start was envisioned as a summer crash program for youngsters about to start school. It was quickly realized that one summer was too short to achieve the stated goals, and the program was extended to cover a full year. Some centers operated on an expanded half-day curriculum, while others provided full-day services.

Soon Head Start attracted public attention of a different kind. Reports came in of administrative chaos, waste and mismanagement. In truth, this should not have not caused great surprise, in view of the haste with which the program went from conception to implementation. As with many anti-poverty projects, administrative controls lagged far behind program starts - the Head Start Policy Manual, for example, did not become available to service providers until 1967, after Head Start had been running for two years! But for many Americans the real shock came with the release of study after study indicating that Head Start seemingly had no lasting effect on the children. In repeated evaluations,³ it was shown that after an initial period of promising gains in cognitive development, the Head Start children could not be told from their classmates who had not participated in the preschool enrichment program. By the second grade the original gains had been entirely dissipated.

In the course of dismantling the controversial Office of Economic Opportunity, President Nixon transferred administrative responsibilities for Head Start to the newly created Office of Child Development in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. With this move, the program seemed to disappear from the headlines and from the awareness of the American public. Hearing little more about it, many people believed that it had been discontinued. In an informal poll of forty New Jersey residents presumed to be reasonably well-informed, conducted by the Center staff in early 1976, fifteen per cent of the respondents believed this to be the case, while forty-three per cent stated that they did not know what had become of Head Start.

In actuality, Head Start has survived quietly and become a staple in many urban communities. While it may not have lived up to the highest hopes, it has received wide acceptance among parents in poverty areas who appreciate the medical and dental screenings, the good meals, the convenience of transportation to the centers, and the time off for mothers. Nationally, the program now enrolls 379,000 children a year in 9,400 centers.⁴ In New Jersey, about 6,700 youngsters participate at nearly 200 centers.⁵

In the 1960's, the nation went to battle on two fronts, a declared War on Poverty and an undeclared one in Vietnam. As history would have it, victory eluded us on both battlefields. These mobilizations did, however, create an expansionist economy that accelerated the participation of women in the labor force. A new constituency for full-day child care was created among middle and higher income groups, where organized all-day group care had never taken hold before. Their consciousness raised by the dynamic new feminist movements, women demanded government support for readily affordable day care that would be accessible to all who want it, not just the poor and not just the full-time working mother. Furthermore, despite the lack of lasting educational benefits from Head Start, the optimism of the new learning theorists had made an impact on sophisticated mothers wanting the latest in pedagogic innovations. Dr. Jerome Bruner of Harvard University, for example, had given widely publicized assurances that "any subject can be taught in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development." The cry, therefore, was not simply for day care, but for *developmental* day care that would stimulate intellectual, physical, social and emotional growth.

Another word came into vogue in association with day care: *comprehensive*. It was agreed that since the child would spend the major portion of his time at the center, routine health care should also be part of the program. Other built-in expectations were psychological services, family counseling, superior nutrition, and community control. In other words, the demand was for *high-quality, universal, comprehensive, developmental day care*.

The newly elected President Nixon was not insensitive to the mood of the moment in 1969. In the first three months of his presidency he repeatedly prodded Congress for legislation making developmental services available to the nation's children. After trying various approaches, Congressional consensus coalesced around the Mondale-Brademas Bill, which was passed by Congress in October 1971 after many bitterly fought compromises and numerous hearings of sharply conflicting testimony. In the final compromise, eligibility was again limited to the poor and near-poor, with a sliding-scale fee for those in the upper range of eligibles that carried with it the seeds of later expansion to a wider constituency. It provided an allocation of \$2.1 billion annually for the next two years, an amount everyone recognized as grossly inadequate to do the job.

On December 10, 1971, President Nixon vetoed the Comprehensive Child Development Act (Mondale-Brademas Bill). The furor it had created and the questions it raised about government intervention in traditional family prerogatives apparently caused second thoughts in the Administration. The President backtracked. He cited inordinate administrative complexities and the probability of sky-rocketing program costs — a realistic consideration, after the disheartening financial experience with Medicare and Medicaid programs enacted a few years before. He referred to its family-weakening implications, and contended that he held "the conviction that such far-reaching national legislation should not, must not, be enacted in the absence of a great national debate upon its merit and broad public acceptance of its principles. Few contend that such a national debate has taken place."

Nevertheless, since the presidential veto in the waning days of 1971, publicly subsidized day care has expanded phenomenally - still without any discernible national debate. Table I illustrates this rapid growth at the national level.

TABLE I

Child care funded under Part A of Title IV of the Social Security Act,
Adapted from: Child Care Data and Materials,
Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, October 1974

Fiscal Year	Children Served	Federal Contribution	Total Costs
1970	443,472	\$144,013,000	\$211,084,000
1971	568,587	\$226,293,000	\$324,290,000
1972	768,341	\$378,392,000	\$531,242,000
1973	736,980	\$497,399,000	\$680,198,000
1974 (estimate)	801,136	\$594,249,000	\$810,665,000

Three points must be stressed in presenting the above information:
—the difference between federal contribution and full costs is largely made up by state and local taxes.

—not all child care is necessarily licensed center day care.

—these figures do not represent total federal expenditures for child care. Programs such as Head Start are not included. The expenditures are only those under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act.

The same growth phenomenon is readily observed in New Jersey. From the maze of figures available, we have selected in Table III the data presented by the Director of the Division of Youth and Family Services at the legislative hearings February 18, 1975, because they appear to be more internally consistent in head-count methodology and program components in the year-to-year progression than other information at our disposal.

TABLE III

Expenditures and number of children served by the state of New Jersey,
Division of Youth and Family Services, 1972 - 1975

Fiscal Year	Children Served	Total Program Costs
1972	12,364	\$3,890,000
1973	17,343	17,262,000
1974	25,578	24,029,000
1975 (estimate)	33,396	37,091,000

(These figures are undercounts, as they do not include expenditures for an unknown number of children for whom day care was made available through county welfare boards. Other programs such as Head Start are not included.)

To understand what has been happening, it is necessary to go back once more to the early 1960s and focus on yet another development in the complex history of subsidized day care that affects conditions prevailing today.

Beginning in 1962, federal legislation has allowed for the payment of child care services for welfare recipients who wanted to work. For a number of years it remained an insignificant program under which some children were cared for in the homes of neighborhood families while the parent worked. In 1967, as part of the anti-poverty campaign, projects were begun to train the poor and those on public assistance for jobs that would permit them to become self-supporting. Provisions for the care of the children of the trainees were a part of these projects. Washington encouraged the states to develop child care resources as quickly as possible, offering a formula of federal aid for day care that granted three dollars for every local dollar. In some cases, the federal subsidy was on an even more generous nine-to-one basis.

The states had powerful reasons of their own for cooperating. Welfare rolls were climbing steadily, bringing in a 50 per cent reimbursement rate from the national government. Here then was a scheme that promised to reverse the rise in welfare payments, and at the same time bring in a bonanza in federal dollars. It required little state money in return, as the twenty-five per cent match could often be raised from private sources and local governments. What's more, it would create jobs at the lower levels of the occupational scale, jobs that could be filled by some of the public-assistance recipients who were the prime target group in this anti-poverty drive. The potential for eventually upgrading the skills and professional responsibilities of the child care workers and providing an upward "career ladder" for people all too often placed in dead-end jobs was another attraction.

The early Nixon administration was much taken with the slogan "Workfare, Not Welfare." This was the philosophic foundation of the Family Assistance Plan, Nixon's far-reaching and most controversial domestic proposal. Funds for child care had to be a component of any "workfare" plan. Thus, the President was in the somewhat peculiar position of opposing the comprehensive child development proposals of the Mondale-Brademas bill while advocating baby-sitting appropriations for the poor.

It was in many respects an ill-timed and untenable stand. The Head Start programs continued to aspire toward educational enrichment for disadvantaged preschoolers; middle-class feminists were agitating for universal, quality developmental child care; and the country's minorities were hardly in a mood to accept second-best for their children on the basis of ill-defined cost-effectiveness arguments. Thus, the day-care model that experienced the largest growth in the 1970's has been the more expensive center-based group care with "developmental" components in its curriculum.

Day Care, 1976: An Update

After the failure of Congress to override President Nixon's veto of the Mondale-Brademas legislation, several other such bills were introduced with varying degrees of seriousness. Uninhibited by any prospect of success, Representatives Bella Abzug

and Shirley Chisholm of New York came up with a generous program that would have gradually extended eligibility to segments of the non-poor population. Start-up costs of \$43 billion were requested for 1973, and operating costs of \$10 billion for 1975.

A more credible attempt to revive the issue in Congress was made by Senator Mondale and Representative Brademas. At this writing, their Child and Family Services Act of 1975 is lingering in committees awaiting disposition. Price-tagged at a much lower cost figure than the 1971 bill, it is nevertheless an ambitious, truly comprehensive proposal that can best be appreciated by some selected quotations from it. In Title I, Section 101, for example, it calls for

"establishing, maintaining, and operating child and family service programs, which may include - (A) part-day or full-day child care programs, in the child's own home, in group homes, or in other child care facilities, which provide the educational, health, nutritional, and social services directed toward enabling children participating in the program to attain their maximum potential; (B) other health, social, recreational, and educational programs designed to meet the special needs of children and families including before- and after-school and summer programs; (C) family services, including in-home and in-school services, and education consultation for parents, other family members functioning in the capacity of parents, youth, and prospective and expectant parents who request assistance in meeting the needs of their children; (D) social services including information, consultation and referral to families that request such services to help them determine the appropriateness of child and family services and the possibility of alternate plans; (E) (i) prenatal and other medical care, including services to expectant mothers who cannot afford such services, designed to help reduce malnutrition, infant and maternal mortality and the incidence of mental retardation and other handicapping conditions, and (ii) postpartum and other medical services to recent mothers; (F) programs designed (i) to meet the special needs of ethnic groups, including minority groups, Indian, migrant children, and children from families with special language needs, and (ii) to meet the needs of all children to understand the history and cultural backgrounds of ethnic groups including minority groups which belong to their communities and the role of members of such groups in the history and cultural development of the nation and the region in which they reside; (G) food and nutritional services; (H) diagnosis, identification, and treatment of visual, hearing, speech, medical, dental, nutritional, and other physical, mental, psychological and emotional barriers to full participation in child and family service programs; (I) special activities designed to identify and ameliorate identified physical, mental, and emotional handicaps and special learning disabilities as an incorporated part of programs conducted under this title; (J) programs designed to extend child and family service gains (particularly parent participation) into Kindergarten and early primary grades, in cooperation with local educational agencies..."

That's for openers.

Eligibility extends above the poverty line, with a provision for sliding-scale fees in the upper eligibility range. But the bill also provides for the preparation of physical plants, administration of Offices of Child and Family Services at the national and state levels; evaluation, standard-setting and enforcement, research and demonstration, etc. All that for one billion federal dollars plus a local match of 20 per cent for a total bargain price of \$1.20 billion. Few observers held out much hope for enactment in 1976, perhaps in part because the price tag attached to the bill seems so inadequate for the intended task.

Of more immediate import is the recent implementation of the "Title XX" provisions on October 1, 1975. Title XX refers to the recent amendments of the Social Security Act, the "Social Service Amendments of 1974 - Service Programs for Individuals and Families," which consolidate a range of services formerly covered by Title IV-A and VI of the Social Security Act. It calls upon the states to formulate a comprehensive plan for social services that addresses the following goals:

- I) achieving or maintaining economic self-support to prevent, reduce, or eliminate dependency;
- II) achieving or maintaining self-sufficiency, including reduction or prevention of dependency;
- III) preventing or remedying neglect, abuse, or exploitation of children and adults unable to protect their own interests or preserving, rehabilitating or reuniting families;
- IV) preventing or reducing inappropriate institutional care by providing for community-based care, home-based care, or other forms of less intensive care; or
- V) securing referral of admission for institutional care when other forms of care are not appropriate, or providing services to individuals in institutions.

The public must be involved in the Title XX planning process, and must have opportunities to review and comment on the plans. Although the prime target group is made up of recipients of various categorical assistance programs, the law leaves the states much latitude in determining eligibility, in types of services to be provided, in modes of service delivery and in setting priorities -- subject to an overall fiscal limitation of \$87.75 million in federal money for New Jersey in the 1976 fiscal year.

Title XX by no means represents all of New Jersey's available social-service support; it constituted only about 37 per cent of such expenditures in the state for 1976 (excluding income payments and medical services for the indigent). But Title XX is of very special interest to policy analysts because it was devised as a vehicle for broadening access to social services to near universal proportions. Under the amendment, the states are allowed to extend eligibility, for some or all programs, to people with incomes up to 115 per cent of the state's median income. In an affluent state like New Jersey, where the median income for 1976 was determined as \$15,744 for a family of four, families with clearly middle-class incomes could potentially be eligible for partly subsidized services -- incomes up to \$18,106 for a family of four in this state. A fee system must be devised for those receiving services whose income exceeds 80 per cent of the median.

In actuality, harsh fiscal realities have effectively checked the universal-service rhetoric of Title XX. No further monies were appropriated with passage of the amendment, and the \$2.5 billion ceiling for these service categories that had been allocated nationally for a number of years still prevails. Due to this restriction, New Jersey has chosen to limit initial income eligibility to those earning no more than 80 per cent of the median income for most services -- a maximum of \$12,595 for a family of four. It is pertinent to note here that of the \$87.75 million allowed to New Jersey for Title XX programs, the largest single amount -- \$28.36 million or 32 per cent of the total -- has been designated for "Developmental Day Care for Children."⁶

IN SUMMARY, history shows that today's day care programs had their beginnings in the day nurseries and nursery schools of the 19th and early 20th centuries. A variety of motives were at work: to care for deprived children of the poor, to allow mothers to work, to provide jobs for teachers. Many of these motives were prompted by short-term considerations -- a war, a depression, a passing phase in the nation's industrialization. In the past decade, these motives have survived in the design and advocacy of programs aimed at long-term goals -- eliminating poverty and accomodating to fundamental changes in American family life. These three motives might be termed (1) custodial, (2) developmental, and (3) job-creating. In the most recent attempts to design day care programs at the state and national level, all three motives are present in full strength. The mixture, which has not been formulated into anything as precise as a "policy," has important consequences in terms of cost, social effects and controversy. Even so, without a policy, day care is one of the fastest growing programs in our governmental repertoire. It is obviously headed for an important place in the scheme of things.

Notes - Chapter 1

¹John R. Dill, Ph. D., "Day Care Learning: A Study of Comparative School Achievement of Day Care Children," Published by the Day Care Council of New York, 1974.

²Brazziel, W., "Two Years of Head Start," Phi Delta Kappa, 1967, 48:344-348.

³The most publicized of these studies was done by the Westinghouse Learning Corporation and Ohio University, *The Impact of Head Start: An Evaluation of the Effects of Head Start on Children's Cognitive and Affective Development*, June 1969. Executive summary available from The Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, Springfield, Virginia 22151.

See also Cunningham, Grover and Pierce-Jones, John, *A Comparison of Head Start Children With a Group of Head Start Eligibles After One Year in Elementary School*, August 1969. Available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Drawer O, Bethesda, Maryland 20014, as EDO 37247.

⁴According to James Robinson, Director of Project Head Start, as quoted in *Young World*, N.J. Association for the Education of Young Children, Autumn 1973, p.15.

⁵Information received in February 1976 from Ms. Elaine P. Danavall, Director, Office of Child Development, Department of HEW, Region II.

⁶*New Jersey Comprehensive Social Service Plan for FY '76*, Department of Institutions and Agencies, p ix, Table B.

The Varieties of Day Care

"With the increasing involvement of government in supporting children's services, it is extremely important to guard against the development of sterile uniformity... we should have a deliberate policy of promoting diversity in child care and early education arrangements."

From Children and the Public Responsibility, by the Massachusetts Early Education Project, Richard Rowe, Director; reprinted by the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., Washington, D. C., 1972

DAY CARE IS hardly a well-defined, monolithic entity. On the contrary, the term is usually qualified by a string of explanatory adjectives, such as "center developmental infant care" or "family after-school care," that bespeak of differences in the ages of children receiving care, the places where care is given, the sponsorship of the care-givers, and the nature of activities the children engage in. These adjectives are by no means neutral descriptions. They are at the vortex of numerous ideological, political and sociological disputes. The taxonomy we present here in introducing some of the controversies may seem overly simplified to the initiated, but we believe it to be of help in clarifying the discussion for those less familiar with the subject.

Categorization by Age

1. *Infant Day Care*

It is well documented that the early nurseries accepted very young babies along with toddlers and older children. In France, a system of subsidized *creches* has been in operation more or less continuously since the beginning of this century. Nevertheless, in America, organized group care for infants was until recently almost unavailable and is only now emerging from the low esteem in which it was held. It was felt that the infant enjoys a unique relationship with the mother that cannot be duplicated in group settings.

Influential studies on the effects of maternal separation reinforced this impression. Dr. René Spitz, for instance, in a widely known research finding, showed that infants removed from the mother by lengthy hospitalization develop "anaclytic depression" which makes them susceptible to infection and other diseases, causes emotional withdrawal and early death.¹ British psychiatrist John Bowlby confirmed the negative effects of maternal deprivation on the development of the very young.² In light of what we know, it would be impossible to argue that one can raise happy and healthy children in the absence of a mother or mother-substitute.

Yet other models of baby care suggest that children can do nicely with regular but part-time mothering when a consistent substitute is available during the mother's absence. The Israeli *kibbutz*, with its brood of healthy and friendly little ones and its tradition of collective child-rearing aroused much curiosity in educational circles. In the mid-60's, Bettye Caldwell started an Infant Center at the State University of New York at Syracuse for disadvantaged children, hoping to provide a very early counterbalance to the lack of stimulation in their homes. A gifted and prolific writer, Ms. Caldwell has repeatedly told of great success in her endeavors. She has made numerous converts to the cause of infant center day care.

Other reports have also been reassuring. Dr. Jerome Kagan, a well-known Harvard psychologist, recently reviewed the literature on the subject and commented that "group care for young children does not seem to have much of an effect, either facilitating or debilitating, on the cognitive, social, or affective development of most children."³ His own research on the "Effects of Infant Day Care on Psychological Development" compares groups of Chinese and Caucasian babies from both middle-class and working-class families attending a high quality center, with closely paired control groups reared at home. In all cases the center infants developed very much like their peers at home. Dr. Kagan and his colleagues conjecture that even for children who spend most of their waking hours away from home, the home experience is more emotionally charged and therefore dominates in shaping overall development.⁴ While such findings are comforting on one level (day care centers seem to do no harm) they are no encouragement to those who would use infant day care on a massive scale to counteract cultural deprivation in the home.

In the past, infants in group care were prone to respiratory and intestinal diseases. However, the control of virulent contagious illnesses through immunization, the availability of antibiotics and the wide acceptance of public health measures

in food preparation have removed health hazards as an obstacle to group care. Though a high illness-caused absentee rate for infants is still anticipated by planners in this field, the experience of infant nurseries has not supported this assumption.

Those concerned with group care for the very young have recognized the intense and time-consuming nature of the relationship between the care-giver and the infant. They have tried to maintain staff-child ratios low enough to allow very personal and constant attention. Regulations promulgated by the Department of Education and Welfare in 1974 insists on a ratio of one adult for each infant under six weeks old in subsidized facilities. This may at first seem ridiculous - a mother at home caring for newborn twins would fail these standards. It is also prohibitively expensive. Upon reflection, however, what the policy drafters are saying is that this age group is not a candidate for group care. For children aged six weeks to three years, the regulations call for one adult for each four children - a ratio that responsible providers surpass. The Babyland Nursery in Newark, for example, maintains staff ratios of two adults for each five children.

Despite the high costs of group care for infants, there are signs of growth in this sector. In New Jersey, the Division of Youth and Family Services reported 184 such spaces in the 1974 fiscal year, 363 in 1975, and further growth is planned. Agitation for this service has been spearheaded by feminists who find that the demands of day-to-day infant care interfere with career preparation and professional aspirations of women. Another boost in the demand for the public provision of such care results from the vastly increased birth rate among high school and even junior high school students who must have some such service in order to complete their secondary education. In the City of Elizabeth, for example, some seventy girls in the student population become mothers every year. This has prompted the city's board of education to help establish an infant center for the care of babies born to these young mothers.

Acceptable day care for very young children is necessarily labor-intensive and therefore expensive. Important questions of public policy are essentially these:

- In view of the monetary limitations inherent in all publicly financed social programs, does infant day care represent a wise investment of day care dollars?

- Moving toward an implied ideal of universal access to day care raises a serious question as to whether this mode of child-rearing is desirable for most children. There is evidence that high-quality group care does no harm; but this is not the same as saying it is beneficial or preferable to traditional home care. Nor has group care been convincingly shown to be a compensatory mechanism in the upbringing of disadvantaged infants.

2. Pre-School Day Care

Most day care services are offered to youngsters of pre-kindergarten age, usually between the ages of three and five. Nursery schools have provided a long and satisfactory experience with organized part-time programs for this age category. From the age of three, the child is increasingly willing to separate from the mother for a time, and is progressively more interested in socializing with other children. His

development has advanced to a stage where he can verbalize pressing wants and open himself to new experiences with little anxiety. There is wide agreement that nursery school attendance benefits children and is a welcome respite for mothers who appreciate a little time for themselves after several years of unrelieved child care.

Pre school care is often viewed as an extended nursery school program. The provision of educational components is considered helpful to the child. By adding caretaking functions, like lunch and snacks, a nap period, and supervised free play, the day can be lengthened to also benefit mothers who want to go to work or school, and through these dual benefits, help the wellbeing of the family as a whole.

It is still open to question whether a full ten-hour day in an environment substituting for the home is really just a spread-out nursery school experience for the youngster, or whether other, less benign influences come into play in the course of a very long day away from home. To get the impact of what it must be like for the child of a mother with a full-time job, one must first concentrate on the passage of time in a normal day for the adult at work – the coffee breaks, the gossip sessions, the lunch period, the busy peaks of activity and the slow, dragged-out moments when the clock stands still. Add to this perhaps an hour, sometimes more, for the parent's travel time between work and the center, and one gets some notion of just how long the day can be for the child at the center. Consider further a mother exhausted from the battles of the marketplace, who still has household chores awaiting her in the home she left early that morning, and speculate on the chances of playful, emotionally rewarding mother-child activities taking place in the waning hours of a weary day.

Some pre-school teachers have also wondered about possible overstimulation in a full-day program and have worried about the lack of opportunities for reflection, quiet and just plain boredom – potent forces in the development of creativity and imagination in the young child.

The dominant controversy regarding pre-school programs is not whether they are beneficial but whether the advantages can be maintained when the program stretches over the full day.

3. After-School Care

The child's start of formal schooling does not end the child-care problems of mothers holding down full-time jobs. The American school day typically ends in mid-afternoon, leaving youngsters to their own devices for several hours when no responsible adult is available at home. There are only 120 school days a year in New Jersey, and they are frequently interrupted by vacation breaks of various duration that have no counterpart in an adult's work schedule. Thus, most mothers who must support families or who function in demanding professional roles are plagued by the need to make arrangements covering the youngster's out-of-school time.

For children who had previously attended pre-school day care centers, the start of kindergarten can bring new traumas. As four-year-olds, they had known the security of belonging in a familiar, substitute home. A few months later they find themselves with no place to go after the abbreviated half-day school session. Many

neighborhood centers found their "alumni" literally knocking on their doors, looking for a place to come into out of the cold. In response to this situation, several centers established kindergarten curricula of their own. A few others made provisions to accept a few of their graduates for whom no alternatives were available.

These are necessarily small programs, limited to the very young school-age child. The term "latch key children" has come into popular usage to describe the many others who have reluctantly been entrusted with keys to the apartment, where they remain without adult supervision or companionship until one of the parents returns. There are school children who are even more pathetic than those with latch keys: those without a key and therefore without entry into their own home, and no place else to go. In urban areas, especially, mothers are sometimes fearful of strangers following their children into the empty home, and believe that it is safer for their youngsters to remain in the streets.

Most people, of course, are able to work out informal arrangements with neighbors and relatives who will keep an eye on the children. But planned, informal after-school programs, under the aegis of community agencies, are coming to the fore as a sensible solution. The annual report for 1975 of the New Jersey Division of Youth and Family Services' Bureau of Day Care mentions "6,715 children of school age in full-year programs during non-school hours and 4,446 children in summer programs."

A major drawback is that many facilities are not near schools and children must be transported to them by bus. This adds to costs and interferes with making the program a natural extension of the school day. It would obviously be desirable to develop recreation and tutoring in the schools themselves, using community workers and high school students rather than teachers, to hold down costs. This may be viewed as an infringement upon their prerogatives by boards of education and by the teachers' unions, and is likely to cause some initial friction. However, there is the counter-argument that schools are too expensive to be used only part of the day for 180 days a year.

In general, it would appear that after-school care is a leading candidate for some sort of subsidized expansion in view of the following considerations:

- there is little controversy about the benign nature of a supervised after-school program, the children's ability to profit from it, and the fact that it does not disrupt family relationships.

- for today's woman, who is statistically likely to bear somewhat less than two children, staying home with one or two very young pre-schoolers is a choice she may cheerfully make, even at some sacrifice in economic well-being and in professional advancement. But devoting twelve or fifteen or more years to this task, especially when the children can manage nicely with minimal group supervision, is probably more than most mothers are willing to do, and would seriously impair any realistic career aspirations for them.

- this type of care does not require highly credentialed personnel and is financially feasible on a broad scale. It seems to have wide support and few detractors, and therefore has possibilities as a universal service.

Categorization by Site

1. Family Day Care

Although public attention has concentrated on center day care, it is clear that with only one million approved day care center slots available in the nation, the majority of the six million children under six whose mothers are at work must be receiving care elsewhere. And indeed, most of these children are being cared for in homes—their own or someone else's, most often by a relative. But a sizable proportion—estimated variously between 20 per cent⁵ and 55 per cent⁶—spend their days in the home of an unrelated person who provides child care for a fee.

Although informal arrangements among neighbors for care of children are probably as old as community life itself, they have only recently been given a formal designation—“family day care”—and become the object of concern for professionals and planners in the early childhood field.

At the heart of their anxiety is the fact that the care-giving family, unlike a day care center, is essentially removed from any public scrutiny. Since most private day care homes take on one to three children, they are exempt from licensing regulations, which in New Jersey only affect facilities caring for six or more youngsters. Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, which prevail for Title XX and other subsidized family day care, go no further than to specify a limit of “no more than two children under two and no more than five in total, including the family day care mother's own children.” In theory, at least, the Division of Youth and Family Services in New Jersey is charged with the supervision of all homes to which the child-care payments are made from public funds. In actuality, the agency's exploding caseloads and its insufficient and inexperienced personnel make this a low priority item and an impossible goal.

Many professionals believe that while good family day care can provide a pleasant “homey” atmosphere and may be suited to the special needs of infants and toddlers, it does not go beyond custodial care and is therefore not a good place for pre-school children who need teaching to stimulate cognitive growth. Their goal appears to be to ultimately replace family day care with center care. They recognize that this is not a practical alternative now because it costs too much. Instead, they have designed experimental programs that reach out to the community day care mothers and connect them in some way to existing centers where they can obtain instruction in practical child development skills. Presently, the Babyland Nursery in Newark is in the second year of a \$138,000 grant to train sixty community day care mothers through various approaches.

A few outspoken professionals have come to the defense of family day care, which they see as a natural community social system which links two families in common concern for the child. Dr. Arthur C. Emlen, Professor of Social Work at Portland State University, has built his reputation on studies that portray family day care as an emerging social institution that has been disparaged or ignored too long. His own research in Portland has pointed to high concordance between natural and day care mothers on matters relating to the child, and to levels of mutual support

that transcend the commercial relationship between them.⁷ Dr. Emlen favors some community support system for local family day care networks, in the form of neighborhood "matchmakers" who would bring service users and providers happily together and would disseminate helpful child development concepts in a natural, unforced way.

Another hotbed of enthusiastic support for the cause of family day care is at Pacific Oaks College in California, which generates many publications on the subject. Students at the college aspiring to careers in early childhood training are enlisted as "field demonstration assistants" to relieve day care mothers attending a certificate course on "How Children Learn and Grow." The students leave appropriate toys on extended loan, and generally learn from these experienced mothers at least as much as they teach. The school has also taken on a matchmaking role in bringing mothers and care-givers together.⁸

Family day care appears to offer a multitude of advantages to the working mother. It is cheaper than center care. Costs run between \$18 and \$28 a week. It is selected on the basis of convenient location, while centers may involve inconvenient travel. Also important, the situation allows the mother a large measure of control - she does not need teams of evaluators and researchers from Washington, Trenton, or Academe to tell her whether things are right. There are no lengthy screenings, no waiting lists, no demands for formalized "parent participation." She can manage arrangements on her own, and terminate them at her discretion. Family day care is certainly a closer facsimile of what the child would experience if the mother were home, with child care naturally integrated into the household routine.

Yet parent dissatisfaction with family day care is reported to be high, especially among parents from minority groups. These parents may have been sold on the concept of compensatory education starting at a young age. They may also look for equipment, certificated professionals and higher costs, as signs of first-class treatment.

Family day care presents some thorny problems which must be weighed judiciously in formulating social policies. Among these:

- where services are provided with public payment, a measure of public scrutiny and accountability is a reasonable expectation. Yet family day care is not easily amenable to licensure; efforts to set up public controls can represent invasions into the private lives of families, in their own homes.

- it is likely that day care proponents will continue to emphasize subsidized center care and make further gains in this area. Thus, the more affordable family day care will be left to those whose income falls just above the eligibility line for subsidized service.

- the fact that family day care most nearly duplicates the milieu of the youngster's own family is not a self-evident advantage; many reformers are anxious to remove their charges from precisely *that* milieu.

- programs that try to improve family day care by sensitizing the care-givers to the learning needs of young children are very expensive and tend to increase costs to a level approaching or exceeding center care. Their effectiveness is as yet unproven.

2. Center Day Care

More and more center day care is being proffered as a panacea for the troubles facing American families today.

No father in the home? Engage male teachers to work with the little ones.

No loving grandmother around, no grandfather? Enlist retired senior citizens to help out at the center as volunteers, and give older people an opportunity for service at the same time.

Is the home unstimulating? Build compensatory education into the center's daily routine.

Is societal discrimination against the poor and minorities fostering an inadequate self-image in the child? Devise programs stressing the positives in the youngster's cultural heritage.

Home too far from the center? No problem, provide transportation back and forth.

Is the child growing up in a non-English speaking household? Plan a bilingual curriculum that supports his linguistic heritage while gradually introducing the English language skills he'll need in school.

Are the parents insufficiently aware of sound child-rearing principles? Offer parent education as part of the curriculum.

Afraid of "professionals" and government taking over? Make "community control" of the centers and "parent participation" on policy boards a basic tenet of the day care movement.

Is the family disorganized and troubled? Bring social workers and family counselors into the centers.

Is the youngster physically or mentally handicapped? Is he emotionally disabled? Install special programs offering speech therapy, physical therapy, occupational therapy, play therapy, medical services and whatever else is believed to be helpful.

Does the mother have child care needs beyond the normal working day? The answer is centers operating around the clock, seven days a week.

Unemployment in the family? Mother—or dad—can become a child care worker, or try a federally sponsored training project to learn new skills while junior is at the center.

No social or personal problem, it seems, is beyond the capacity of day care centers. Twigs of any shape can be skillfully bent to grow tall and straight. As in health care, there are no limits to what we can spend on improvements and expansions. Unlike health care, which has demonstrated what it can do, developmental center day care has not. It is still largely an act of faith. The divorce rate continues to rise, illegitimacy increases, child abuse seems unabated, and the children in urban schools go on performing poorly despite years of compensatory pre-school efforts.

The ideal view of the day care center as a powerful family change agent must still be considered utopian. Some questions come readily to the fore:

—Is parent education, at any level above the superficial, a realistic expectation when parents already spend their days at work and their evenings catching up with things at home?

-Is forceful "parent participation" feasible, for the same reasons?

-Do the center's valiant tries to produce an *ersatz* extended family for the child by using students, volunteers and male teachers help the youngsters in forming emotional attachments, or do they just confuse young minds with their all-too-often ephemeral presence?

-Considering the probably light level of use and the high cost of underutilized facilities, should twenty-four-hour and weekend care be attempted? Would the very availability of such care be a further stimulus for family disorganization?

Many other uncomfortable questions can be raised. From the standpoint of developing public policy for comprehensive center day care, foremost attention must be given to the truism that doing more costs more, and that great cost demands a substantial national consensus to support it. Overwhelming agreement may be difficult to obtain for an expensive program that claims unproven societal benefits and is open only to those deemed unable to pay for it.

Categorization by Sponsorship

Throughout this report, we have been referring to *public* child care in discussing those services that are subsidized by public revenues. Since such subsidized day care is most often provided under *private* auspices, the possibilities for confusion abound. It is therefore expedient to clarify differences by referring to "for-profit" and "non-profit" child care. A third category, "employer-subsidized day care," is a non-profit activity undertaken by a profit-making organization. Finally, there are child care "cooperatives" which operate without subsidy and without profit.

1. Child Care for Profit

Taking care of other people's children has long been a way to make a living - of sorts. French governesses and English nannies were *de rigueur* in upper-class European families until high costs and a more democratic life-style made them obsolete after World War II. In the American South, a Negro "mammy" was often put in charge of the children.

With the massive entry of women into the labor force, commercial care became more readily available to families of modest means. Women who want to take care of a few children in their own homes find this a good way to supplement family incomes. Unhampered by official regulations, they can offer a home-like service at reasonable cost. They represent the bulk of profit-making entrepreneurship in child care.

Predictably, the large market for services also attracted more ambitious operators. There are now about thirteen thousand commercial group care centers in the country, mostly independent operations.⁹ Some are part of chains that try to squeeze out profits by economies of scale.

Many of the commercial operators find day care a difficult business. Though their centers are exempt from the Federal Interagency regulations that apply to those offering subsidized care, they must still comply with state licensing laws on

staff ratios and credentials, and with local health and safety standards. More aggressive enforcement of local and state regulations in recent years assures at least a basic minimum of quality, but at the same time raises costs to the level where profits can evaporate. The fundamental problem is that parents who do not qualify for free or subsidized care often cannot afford to pay very much for this service. As has been observed repeatedly, a single parent earning perhaps \$150 a week, and forced to dish out \$40 for commercial child care in addition to the costs of going to work, often can do better by staying at home and going on welfare. Consequently, a natural ceiling exists on how much can be charged for day care. Beyond that the service is no longer in demand. By raising prices, operators, in effect, put themselves out of business. There is a high casualty rate among centers, especially the more marginal ones. In Georgia, for example, 226 centers folded in 1975.¹⁰ In New Jersey, the licensing unit of the Division of Youth and Family Services knows of 53 such closings between June 1974 and May 1976, a period of depressed economic activity and high unemployment.

Some profit-making establishments have tried to attract public money by accepting children eligible for subsidies. In New Jersey, the State's Division of Public Welfare and the Division of Youth and Family Services have indeed accepted such arrangements and purchased slots in proprietary centers where this seemed convenient or other care was not available. Difficult and disruptive children, avoided by the subsidized community day-care centers with their waiting lists of more tractable candidates, are often placed in profit-making centers eager to win the good graces of the public agencies.

Of late, proprietary part-day nursery schools have fallen upon hard times after a long period of growth and prosperity. Hit hard by the precipitous decline in the birth rate and in the economy, many are unable to fill their facilities. They too are now seeking the trade of working mothers by making schedule adjustments which allow for a longer school day. The child participates in the regular morning session, stays on for a brown-bag lunch brought from home, rests and waits to be picked up in the early afternoon.

Despite hard times, the commercial child care community has not organized to agitate for public subsidies for their operations. The National Association for Child Development and Education, a Washington-based group representing proprietary interests, did not even reply when invited by us to present its views on their role in resolving child care problems. One of its members in New Jersey, Ben Applebaum, speaking for himself as the owner of three proprietary centers rather than as a spokesman for the association, did voice the hope that such facilities will be able to get public funds under the Mondale-Brademas bill now in Congress, or any other legislation that may eventually be enacted. He pleaded the cause for greater use of struggling proprietary centers by the state, through the purchase of more slots for eligible children at a rate competitive with the non-profit centers, before encouraging community groups to start up new non-profit centers.

Privately run day care centers may benefit from new allowable child care deductions under the 1975 Tax Reduction Act. The new regulation will permit working parents with earned family incomes of up to \$35,000 to deduct a maximum of

\$2,400 a child yearly for out-of-home care. Parents with higher incomes, up to \$44,600, can receive partial tax benefits for child care expenses. These new regulations are a breakthrough of sorts for working parents above the poverty line. They are expected to be a boon to non-subsidized private day care operations.

2. Non-Profit Day Care

At its best, child care is definitely a money-losing proposition. It is a labor of love that must be its own reward. Mothers get no remuneration for their travails. Surrogate mothers do not fare very well either on the occupational compensation scale.

Caring for children without expectation of riches has a long and honorable tradition. Our earliest efforts in group care were philanthropically inspired, and the centers that made history were run by non-profit private community agencies, such as hospitals and settlement houses. Non-profit private community groups have continued to be a major source of day care sponsorship and constitute the largest class of recipients of day care subsidies, in New Jersey as well as nationally.

The extensive systems of state-run day nurseries in communist societies are designed to free women for work and, not incidentally, to inculcate the sanctioned ideology in the children. In America, the spectre of government financing and operation of such facilities arouses concern about the possibility of an official doctrine being fostered in the curriculum, and of undue influence upon the private life of families.

To their credit, it is a role that our governments, in all their various state and federal incarnations, have eschewed consistently. A reading of policy papers and research reports emanating from Washington or Trenton gives reassurance that the agencies have no particular dogma in mind. Diffidence about intruding into the cultural values of families and communities is a prevailing principle.

Mayor LaGuardia of New York City set the tone for all this in the early 1940s when he encouraged private non-profit service groups to take over the operations of the former Works Progress Administration centers from the city's Board of Education. Essentially, the pattern is this: the state contracts with a community agency - a church, a "Y", a settlement house, or a local community action board - to provide services for which they are reimbursed at an agreed-upon rate per child per week. Decisions about personnel, programs, individual admissions and other matters are left to the center's policy-making boards, on which parents are expected to have a voice.

Until recently, the State of New Jersey interpreted its role narrowly as a conduit and fiscal agent for monies from Washington to the "community day care centers." It expected the centers to raise the local match money (twenty-five per cent) on their own from private sources and local government units. The state itself contributed no funds toward running these centers until 1974, when it reluctantly made a small contribution under the increasing pressure of centers unable to find local matching funds. Since then, demands for more state money to community centers have escalated, though New Jersey's state treasury has been experiencing

unprecedented fiscal constraints due to rising costs and falling tax revenues. (In 1976, New Jersey passed its first state income tax.) This conflict has strained relationships between the leadership of the 250 community day care centers under contract and the state's Division of Youth and Family Services (DYFS).

Through the vagaries of history, the State of New Jersey finds itself directly operating twenty-two day care centers. It inherited eight of these, all in Jersey City, from the now-defunct Model Cities program. Others were established as an accommodation to the Work Incentives Program (WIN), a skills training project for welfare clients that was initially impeded by a lack of child care resources for trainees. These centers are in the privileged position of getting their local match money from the state, and thus are spared the painful scrounging around for local contributions that plague the community day care centers. This situation is ready-made to increase tensions between the non-profit providers and the state bureaucracy.

While there is considerable agreement on the desirability of letting community groups operate centers with a large measure of autonomy, the issue of how much accountability is due the state has been debated. The use of public money requires supervision, but this is time-consuming for center directors who must fill out endless forms, cope with deadlines, attend meetings and deal with bureaucrats. Not unreasonably, they expect guidance from the state in fulfilling their obligations, but clear and consistent advice is not always easy to come by from that source.

A rather extreme example of recalcitrance by community centers in the face of official demands occurred in New York City in the spring of 1973. The day care leadership, known nationally for its vocal militancy, refused to provide the city's Agency for Child Development with more information on application and eligibility forms needed by the city to get state and federal reimbursements, because they feared that such information would hurt ineligible center clients. They organized some 500 mothers to stage a sit-in at the offices of the Agency for Child Development and claimed that the agency should be accountable to mothers, and not to the city, state or federal governments.¹¹ While this type of challenge is undoubtedly rare, subtler forms of resistance to officialdom are routine.

3. Employer-Subsidized Day Care

Inevitably, the question of an employer's responsibility in providing child care for employees is bound to arise. To the uninitiated, the work site would appear to be an ideal location for a day care center. It would involve no additional travel time for parents. It would even permit them to look in on the children at lunch time and to be available to them in case of emergency. The employers, too, would stand to gain from sponsoring fully or partly subsidized day care. There might be less absenteeism and turnover; morale might be improved. Enterprises that rely heavily on the labor of young women, such as textile manufacturers, hospitals, and telephone companies, would seem to lend themselves perfectly to such arrangements.

Yet these arguments, so forceful in the abstract, have not held up in the concrete. A study of employer-subsidized day care carried out by the Inner City Fund for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and published in 1972, identified a national total of only seven centers sponsored by industries, five by government departments, and ninety-eight by hospitals.¹²

The study describes the centers as grossly underused. Employees, it seems, do not like to travel to work with their children, preferring to have them remain in their home neighborhoods. Day-time opportunities to visit with the children go largely neglected. Any charge for the service is deeply resented; the only facility operating at capacity was one that charged nothing at all.

A few years ago, in what may have been a spurt of fashionable social consciousness, several companies launched day care centers. Generous federal grants provided the incentives needed beyond altruism. When the grants were terminated, the companies pulled out of the day care business, disillusioned by underusage and high costs. Several, most notably AVCO and KLH in the Boston area, handed operations over to community groups. Others, like the Bro-dart Company in Williamsport, Pa., closed shop entirely after nine months of trying to make a go of it.

In New Jersey, Newark's Beth Israel Hospital operated a day care center for its personnel from 1969 to 1974. After some initial financial support and volunteer help from local chapters of the National Council of Jewish Women, the center applied for government subsidy. It found that it would have to supply the local match money and that many valued employees would be ineligible for subsidy because they earned too much. Not enough workers in the eligible range were interested to keep the center filled with children. Beth Israel too discontinued the child care operations.

In what may well be the ultimate irony, even Uncle Sam appears incapable of financing and managing this type of complex and expensive service beyond the opening publicity stage. In the summer of 1971, the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare opened a facility for the children of its employees "as a model for other employers throughout the country. . . to demonstrate the best of current day care practices. . . how best to combine day-long custodial care and the learning and development opportunities traditional to nursery school."¹³ Tuition charges were two dollars a week for most of the children. It would be hard to imagine a better heeled, more technically knowledgeable sponsor for such a project. But when we checked its status in early 1976, we learned that it had followed a stormy career in its five-year existence. Unable to arrange for sustained financial support, the Office of Education transferred the operation to the National Institute of Education, and finally to the parents. Faced with the operation of a high-cost facility, the parents were shopping around for other sources of money and were still considering converting the center to a cooperative model that would produce some economies.¹⁴

The Ford Foundation, on the other hand has evolved its own simple formulae for assisting its employees with the heavy expenses of child care. Workers at the lower end of the salary scale, including those raising children alone or married to full-time students, are entitled to a weekly cash supplement for child care of up to \$15. The foundation leaves the selection of arrangements entirely to the parents. This has the advantage of keeping the employer clear of thorny educational and operational entanglements; the cost to the company is modest, but makes a real difference in the range of child care options available to the parent-employees. However, while this program may be in keeping with the function of a business whose business it is

to hand out money, one wonders how readily the plan would catch on with more conventional employers.

In the wake of unsatisfactory experiences, on-site employer-sponsored day care does not seem likely to become a significant trend. In the present depressed job market, it is also doubtful that other forms of child care assistance will be offered in the foreseeable future as an incentive to employees. A relevant illustration: a few years ago, the United Teachers Federation in New York City was able to negotiate for subsidized day care service for inactive teachers willing to return to work in inner-city schools; winning this type of special incentive seems unthinkable in the reality of today's surplus of teachers - and of New York's desperate fiscal position.

Though most employers are now able to pick and choose among an oversupply of workers, their freedom to do so is not unrestrained. Industry is feeling the pressure of affirmative action programs on behalf of women, and many now see wisdom in showing some concern for the problems of the working mother. A relatively painless method for doing this has been for industry to contribute toward the local matching funds needed by non-profit private centers operating under Title XX of the Social Security Act, either directly, through pledges to the Division of Youth and Family Services, or indirectly through designated contributions to local United Way campaigns. The rationale is that workers with incomes low enough to qualify for subsidized care will use the services maintained with the help of industry-provided local matching funds.

4. Parent-sponsored Cooperative Child Care

As the popularity of nursery schools filtered down from the upper to the middle classes, the idea of parent-sponsored and operated facilities gained momentum. Basically, this arrangement makes active parent participation in the work of the school a prerequisite for enrollment of the child. Typically, fathers take over routine maintenance tasks; mothers do office work and assist in the classroom. The only paid personnel are the professional teachers. In effect, part of the fee is being paid by the parents' work time, and tuitions are lower. Equally important to the advocates of cooperatives, is the direct involvement of the parents in the life of the school and the child's pride in the parents' participation.

This *modus-operandi* is not really suitable for parents who work full-time. That it is being considered at all for day care centers is a sign of the difficulties of financing such undertakings and of bridging the gap between the child's home and the center. But even part-time nursery programs are turning away from that once-popular mode of operation. According to Shirley Fox, director of a cooperative nursery school and a member of the board of the New Jersey Association for the Education of Young Children, the concept has lost its appeal because mothers are now less willing to forego time for themselves and prefer to pay more in cash to obtain greater leisure. Kathi Meding, President of the Cooperative Pre-School Council of New Jersey, is less sure that cooperatives are on the decline. She feels that their adherents are as enthusiastic about the non-financial benefits as ever. But she concedes that the movement is not dynamic and that no further growth is expected.

Categorization by Program Emphasis

No other dichotomy in day care has been as controversial as the fuzzy division between custodial and developmental care. In practice, these are not "either/or" categories; facilities that pride themselves on the provision of "developmental" care agree that much effort is spent in custodial tasks, and many humble family day care homes that have no lofty "developmental" pretensions give their charges far more than mere safeguarding.

1. Custodial Day Care

At its worst, custodial day care can be every bit as terrible as the rabid "developmentalists" would have us believe it is. It can be shelter in an unsafe environment - dirty, cold, full of hazards like peeling lead paint and rotted stairways. It can mean cheap food without nutrition, served with indifference. It can be a complete lack of games and toys, and a surfeit of harsh discipline. It can be true psychological abandonment.

Or it can be pretty wonderful, like staying home with Mother.

Few parents make claims to any special expertise, yet experience shows that most are able to draw upon their love and mobilize their resources to make home the safe and comforting place most of us remember from our childhoods. Even budget-minded mothers can add cheer to drab surroundings with a bit of imagination. Modest meals can be made to nourish body and soul when simple food preparation becomes a collaborative effort between parent and child and mealtime the occasion for relaxed chatter. A walk with Mother to feed the pigeons in the park, a trip to the store to "help" her shop, these can open new worlds of adventure and delight to a small child.

Nor is it necessary for the mother to spend all her time at the youngster's bidding. As long as she remains physically close, she can pursue other activities and remain a beacon of warmth and light to the child. The average mother going through her daily chores without rigidity, ready to interrupt her routine to interpret this puzzling world to the little one in her charge, is surely a cost-effective and humane teaching resource. It is a resource that in time can be supplemented by the more conscious efforts of professional educators, but its total or prolonged absence from the life of a child is a profound loss which society, in its various efforts at compensation, can only hope to mitigate.

In the real world, of course, there are no "average" mothers, let alone ideal ones. It would be misleading to intimate that such upbringing is available to almost all our children, and it would be unwise to base public policy on such an assumption.

Today's mothers, with fewer children to look after, with no elderly parents or grandparents to care for, with wash-and-wear clothes, throw-away diapers and baby-bottles, pre-packaged foods and instant formulas, and numerous other conveniences at their disposal, have far more time than any previous generation of mothers. Much of this new-found time goes to the electronic intruder that has taken over the American living room - and den, and bedroom, and kitchen. Passively watching

television has become a major pastime for homebound mothers, and an endless hypnotic procession of animated cartoons, game shows and soap operas is robbing their children of parental attention and nurturing interaction.

The average American child now watches twenty-seven hours of television each week, and the strong impact of such prolonged exposure is no longer argued. In a recent interview, Eliot Daley, president of a Princeton firm that designs television programs for children, told of a study that tried to reconstruct to what use these many hours had been put by children before the advent of television. "The finding of the study was, 'Nothing.' What gets squeezed out is just fooling around. An important element in child development is having empty time to fill . . . we are depriving children of boredom, and hence creativity."¹⁵ We are also depriving them of parental availability, of active social experiences, and perhaps of a portion of their childhood by premature exposure on television to aspects of life we formerly took pain to protect them from.

It is widely held that the wonders of television can also be marshalled for the benefit of children. *Sesame Street* is usually given as the foremost example of this type of positive programming. Yet reasonable doubts are being raised even about the true benefits of the sacrosanct *Sesame Street*. A recent study financed and published by the Russel Sage Foundation, directed by psychologist Thomas D. Cook of Northwestern University, compared the mastery of concepts taught in the series by middle-class pre-schoolers and by those from more disadvantaged backgrounds to whom the program is specifically addressed. Findings show that "the direction was toward widening rather than narrowing the gap" between these groups.¹⁶ The explanation seems to lie in the greater parental encouragement to follow the program that the more affluent youngster receives, and the more regular watching pattern that ensues.¹⁷ These findings intimate that children must not be abandoned in the care of even superior television programs, and that these too need close parental supervision if they are to be really beneficial.

Perhaps one real difference that we must recognize between developmental and custodial care is in the role that television is permitted to play in the child care program. Pre-school youngsters who are free to watch television for more than one hour a day, and more than half of that time without an interested adult at their side, are in fact receiving indifferent custodial care—whether at home, in family day care, or at a "developmental" day care center.

2. Developmental Day Care

Developmental day care aspires to provide children with far more than a safe environment, adequate food and adult supervision. A self-description from one such center (New Dimensions Learning Centers, West Orange, a for-profit center that sells slots on a purchase-of-care basis to the Divisions of Public Welfare and Youth and Family Services) tells us that it is "a complete learning environment, stressing the individual needs of each child . . . social, emotional, physical, intellectual and psychological." But most community day care centers will aim beyond the mere enhancement of various aspects of the child's growth, to a concern for "the whole

family." In the 1975 campaign publicity for the United Way of Essex and West Hudson, we are told about one of its beneficiaries, the Community Day Nursery of East Orange:

The vast array of services provided by the . . . Nursery go far beyond the care of little children. . . it is an agency deeply concerned with the family life of the youngsters. . . the nursery becomes both friend and relative to the children and their families. . . we provide counseling for parents, help them utilize resources in the community such as training programs, try to aid with whatever problems the family may have. . . We have psychiatric consultants and psychological services available, as well as a health screening program. We can arrange for a work-up in a hospital if there is a need to determine the extent of the child's problems.

The director explains the need for the center: "More women go out to work because it is socially acceptable; they no longer want to limit their work to the home. . . there is a widespread need for the services we provide."

A model developmental day care center would be characterized by many, if not all, of the following: a high proportion of credentialed professionals on its staff - early childhood educators, social workers, nutritionists, nurses; consultants in pediatrics, dentistry, psychiatry, psychology, speech correction, etc.; the staff would be steadily engaged in in-service training and encouraged to continue academic studies; students from local colleges and universities would serve internships, using the center as a laboratory for observation, skill training and research; the staff-child ratio would be high to allow for individual attention; special equipment of good design and quality would be on hand - for climbing, riding, sliding, to promote gross motor coordination; programmed individual "learning machines" for reading readiness and other cognitive skills; piano, individual rhythm instruments, audio-visual equipment, a music specialist, for musical training; a well-stocked library, for staff as well as for the children's needs; a good selection of toys, such as puzzles, blocks, board games; ample room and supplies for arts and crafts; extensive lesson planning and record keeping on the children's progress; services for parents in the form of ongoing parent education, incentives for parent involvement in center activities, and family counseling.

There are serious difficulties with this approach to child care, some of which have been raised in our discussion of the center day care model. Costs escalate rapidly with every attempted extension of services, and so do the doubts about their effectiveness. Some of these additional components add little more than rhetoric and costs. For example, a concern for the child's family life is an implicit expectation we have of all decent caregivers, and referring parents to community resources is hardly earth-shaking enough to warrant the United Way claim that "the whole family is served by the community nursery."

The notion that high credentialed professionals are superior to academically untrained but experienced child care workers has been challenged repeatedly. Dr. Burton L. White states that, "The older point of view which restricted child care practitioners at the higher levels to those who had degrees in early education, does not seem to me to be supportable today. . . people with properly supervised experience very often, in my opinion, function at least as well and often considerably

more effectively than those with more formal credentials. . . I feel strongly that the formal credential is of only marginal importance when it comes to children under two-and-a-half. . . "18 Two other well-known studies, by Abt Associates and by the Child Welfare League of America, find no correlation between academic credentials and the quality of child care delivered.

In the area of preventive health care, enormous sums and efforts are invested in the diagnostic screening of young children for suspected emotional and learning shortcomings. The rationale is that early detection will lead to treatment and thus avoid later problems. But testing techniques in these areas are far from reliable, and yield impressive-sounding diagnoses that are so general as to be meaningless, yet carry the danger of stigmatizing the child. Effective treatment for such conditions is virtually non-existent. In a thorough and reasoned study directed by Sheldon White for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and published in 1973¹⁹ it was recommended that screening priorities be made on the basis of diagnostic sophistication, the risks of late identification, and the availability of remedies. By those criteria, large-scale testing should be limited to suspected sensory and physical disorders.

It is naive to assume that pouring more money into developmental day care will yield more capable children and happier families. Somewhere above the level of decent care we seem to reach a point of quickly diminishing returns, where it takes more and more to effectuate smaller and smaller improvements. The limits of what we can expect have been recognized by at least some thinkers in the field: "It may be quite painful but in the long run beneficial for taxpayers and legislators living in the 1970's to grapple with the seemingly harsh reality that programs for young children, while often warm and joyous, do not and cannot by themselves make fundamental changes in society."²⁰

The influential and controversial Sheldon White report²¹ sounds similar cautions. Stating that we have no way at present to know what must be added to basic care to promote children's development generally, it concludes that "Research is needed to more definitely understand the potential and present effects of day care for children; in its absence, substantial investment in developmental day care appears inadvisable." And further: "There is very little evidence one way or another about the positive or negative effects of day care." Recommending against a major investment in developmental day care does not "imply negative judgment about the value of the programs. It implies recognition that the value is not demonstrable. . . doesn't deserve major implementation at the expense of other kinds of services that have clearer, less speculative value for children."

Within the broad category of developmental day care, two subcategories need explanation:

a) Day Care Programs for Handicapped Children

The young child with gross developmental problems - blindness, cerebral palsy, severe mental retardation - presents extraordinary problems to his family, and poses difficult challenges for a humane society. Such children require specialized therapy that most mothers, no matter how loving and well-intentioned, cannot provide

unaided. The costs of these efforts are formidable, and are at best incompletely covered by any health insurance the family is likely to have. Thus, the family is trying to do the utmost for such a child faces the prospect of pauperism. A palsied child, for example, may require several sessions per week with physical, occupational and speech therapists in order to achieve even a small measure of the independence that normal children come to effortlessly.

Delay in treatment carries the risk of ineffectiveness. Help must arrive very early. The blind child must be taught to navigate in relative safety at the time he learns to move about; the orthopedically handicapped youngster must learn to use prosthesis as a natural adjunct of locomotion; the deaf child must be reached in his silent world at about the age when speech normally develops.

Though many of these interventions could probably be offered within a medical setting, such as a hospital, there are persuasive arguments for integrating treatment into a nursery program. Children with developmental handicaps are most often socially isolated. The nursery can provide contacts with other children. The playroom also removes some of the emphasis on pathology that characterizes hospitals, and individual sessions with staff therapists can be unobtrusively worked into the child's play routine. Parents caring for a child with severe handicaps carry enormous burdens and need occasional relief. A part-day nursery can provide that help. It can also function as a center in which parents can seek and give mutual support and learn skills that will extend the benefits of the therapy sessions into the daily routine at home.

For the severely disabled child, publicly subsidized, highly specialized, part-time day care would seem to be mandatory for a society which considers itself humane.

Most specialists in education for the handicapped believe that youngsters with mild developmental problems could benefit greatly from attendance in regular nursery programs, where they would find normal role models to emulate. The Head Start program has provisions for incorporating some handicapped children into its curriculum, and publicly funded community day care programs are under some pressure to do so. The CHEN Day Care program in Newark tries to recruit about one-third of its enrollees from the ranks of children with language and perceptual disabilities. In general, however, program directors are less than anxious to take on handicapped children, claiming that they make difficult demands on the staff's time, and that the programs are not designed to handle the special medical and educational needs of such children. Most of all, youngsters with severe emotional problems are shunned, though virtually no other specialized facilities are open to them.

In the final analysis, we are faced here with a classic Catch-22 dilemma; while only children with relatively mild debilities can be expected to be integrated successfully into a regular day care program, only gross deviations can be reliably diagnosed in pre-school years.

b) Bi-Cultural Day Care Programs

Widespread disenchantment with the traditional "melting pot" and with the achievements of racial integration has given rise to an era of resurgent ethnic con-

sciousness in American society. In day care, this is manifested in the formation of bi-cultural centers, primarily in hispanic and black communities.

The enabling mechanism is Title XX (formerly Title IV-A) which provides public funds to non-profit community boards for the establishment and operation of child care facilities that they are free to run autonomously. In localities with large numbers of Spanish-speaking residents, community leaders have founded day care centers that tend the needs of children who do not speak English at home. The culture of the homeland is highlighted in meals with a Latin flavor, in songs, stories and games from the native countries, in the observance of ethnic feasts and holidays. The English language and the customs of mainstream America are introduced in the curriculum in measured doses. In a sense, the centers serve as cultural hothouses to guard against too rapid an evaporation of the child's native culture - a goal diametrically opposed to the assimilation stressed by earlier generations of tenement day nurseries.

For black children, the programs emphasize that black is beautiful. The African heritage and the contributions of Afro-Americans are stressed in a curriculum that strives to instill a sense of pride and self-acceptance in the children.

Especially in the hispanic sector of the community activism, there is much agitation to expand this type of day care service. In New Jersey, the Puerto Rican Coalition for Child Development has publicly called for the establishment of "50 community-sponsored, full-day, bilingual, bi-cultural child development centers serving 3,000 preschool children through provision of full funding."²² In this context, the demand for "full funding" implies providing state funds to match the 75 per cent federal support available through Title XX. The Division of Youth and Family Services is on record as favoring the expansion of such centers as a high priority in its day care program.

Parochialism is of course not unknown in American education, especially along religious lines. What is novel in this situation is that cultural parochialism is now supported by public funds.

No serious attacks have been made upon these programs on the basis that they discriminate against other children eligible for subsidized care but whose ethnic background differs from that of the centers' target population. Nevertheless, there is the potential for controversy over the fundamental constitutional issue of public support for selective self-segregation.

WHEN WE DIVIDE and subdivide child care services by category, we achieve more than a mere familiarity with terminology. We begin to see the outlines of controversy, divergent paths for policy, complexities of administration, areas of ignorance, the results of research and the implications for the public treasury.

Subsidized day care is confronted with variant problems dependent on the age of the children involved. Care of infants is costly and its benefits doubtful for society, child and parent. Pre-school children can be fit subjects for subsidized day care, but not necessarily the kind of care being provided now. After-school day care makes sense as a broad program and can be provided readily at reasonable cost. Center day care is in vogue but is more expensive than family day care. Family day care has great potential but is so dependent on the qualities of individual caregivers that it presents formidable problems in administration.

Most day care is provided by non-profit organizations. But as government-

subsidized day care expands, so does red tape and bureaucracy. Profit-making day care centers serve a smaller part of the need and struggle to get by. Changes in tax laws may soon improve this outlook. Current policies, however, almost assure that unsubsidized day care will be second-rate.

Finally, there is custodial and developmental day care, a dichotomy with explosive potential for controversy. The arguments range from theoretical disputes rooted in child psychology to pragmatic considerations about jobs and money.

In the ensuing discussion, we will consider other aspects of these disputes and seek some basis for policies that can make these services answer the needs of the great social movements under way in the nation.

Notes - Chapter 2

¹Spitz, Rene A. and Wolf, Katherine M., "Anaclitic Depression: An Inquiry into the Genesis of Psychiatric Conditions in Early Childhood," *Psychoanalytic Studies of Childhood*, 1946, 2, 313-342. See also yearly *Psychological Abstracts*, 1950 to 1957.

²Bowlby, John, *Maternal Care and Mental Health: A Report Prepared on Behalf of the World Health Organization*, Geneva, 1951.

³Jerome Kagan, et al. "The Effects of Infant Day Care on the Psychological Development." Paper presented at Symposium on "The Effect of Early Experience on Child Development," American Association for the Advancement of Science, February 19, 1976, in Boston, Massachusetts.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Arthur C. Emlen, "Slogars, Slots, and Slander: The Myth of Day Care Need" *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, January 1973, p. 25.

⁶*Child Care Data and Materials*, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, October 1974.

⁷Arthur C. Emlen, *Child Care by Kith: A Study of the Family Day Care Relationships of Working Mothers and Neighborhood Caregivers*, a Research Study of the Tri-County Community Council in Cooperation with Portland State University, 1971.

⁸June Sonit Sale, "Family Day Care: One Alternative in the Delivery of Developmental Services in Early Childhood" *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, January 1973.

⁹"Dilemma for Working Mothers: Not Enough Day Care Centers" in U.S. News and World Report, April 12, 1976, p. 49.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹*The New York Times*, March 27, 1973, p. 51.

¹²Donald G. Ogilvie, *Employer-Subsidized Day Care*, prepared by the Inner City Fund Washington, D.C., January 1972.

¹³*The New York Times*, August 21, 1971, p. 14.

¹⁴Letter from Jaqueline W. Jenkins, National Institute of Education Assistant, to G. Bikales, February 3, 1976.

¹⁵Brian Rooney, "Kids T.V. Expert Doesn't Like What He Sees" *The Princeton Packet*, January 28, 1976.

¹⁶Noel Epstein, "Who Benefits From Sesame Street?" *The Star Ledger*, January 13, 1976.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Burton L. White, Ph. D., Director, Harvard Preschool Project, "Consultant Report on Proposed New Regulations Concerning Child Care in the State of New Jersey," January 14, 1975.

¹⁹*Federal Programs for Young Children: Review and Recommendations* Contract no. HEW-OS-77-170, U.S. Government Printing Office, Publication No. (OS) 74-102, 1973 - Volume III, Recommendations for Federal Program Planning, p. 1.

²⁰The Massachusetts Early Education Project, Richard Rowe, Director, *The Care and Education of Young Children*, reprinted by the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., Washington, D.C. p. 4-23.

²¹*Federal Programs for Young Children*, Vol. III, op. cit., p. 2.

²²Testimony of Yolanda Aguilar De Neely before Assembly Institutions, Health and Welfare Committee, February 19, 1975, Volume II, p. 79A.

The Years Before Kindergarten

"... since the new day care center opened in her neighborhood Sue has earned enough money from her job at the plant to buy new furniture... And instead of being glued to a T.V. set all day, her children are learning their ABC's and how to count at the day care center. One of them is even learning how to read.

Advertisement for the United Way, *House Beautiful*, July 1975

DAY CARE, as we have seen, sometimes goes far beyond the mechanics of the safekeeping of children by someone other than a parent. It can extend into the broader arena of early childhood education. As if the controversies surrounding the delivery of day care services were not perplexing enough, there is great disagreement over how much, if anything, should be taught to children in day care. The early childhood curriculum is embroiled in theoretical disputations that fuel many learned volumes and professional journals.

Something as seemingly straightforward as the mandatory age for the start of school is a subject of heated disagreement. In the Jewish small-town communities of Eastern Europe before World War II, where the acquisition of scholarship was considered the highest good, boys were formally started upon this quest at about the age of three. In the Soviet Union today, compulsory academic training starts at seven. In the United States, the trend has been toward lowering the age of required school attendance. In 1960, the State of California changed its mandated school entry age from eight to six. A few years later, New Jersey lowered its compulsory school enrollment from seven to six (although for the past century New Jersey's Constitution has guaranteed free public schooling to any child of five or older).

Some educators have opposed this trend. They advocate a return to a later start in school. The Moores¹ in particular argue that not until age eight does a child reach his "Integrated Maturity Level" — a stage at which motor, sensory, intellectual and social development are in sufficient balance to permit an unstrained mastery of academics. Observations of normal children whose start of formal schooling was temporarily delayed confirm that they can quickly catch up and surpass children who started earlier.

Yet regardless of their merits, these admonitions are likely to go unheeded. Several forces are operating toward the lowering of the age at which some form of early childhood education becomes available to more and more children.

— The drastically lowered birth rate of the past five years has led to a declining school population and an increasingly tight job market for teachers. Education departments in the colleges, still staffed to the hilt, are pushing for greater national efforts in early childhood education as an outlet for their surplus graduates. The teachers' unions, fearing a loss of jobs and reduced membership rolls, have a large stake in promoting pre-school programs under public school sponsorship. Albert Shanker, the president of the American Federation of Teachers, has demanded that future expansion in publicly funded day care and other early childhood programs be taken from the control of community groups and private entrepreneurs. He wants it entrusted to the educational establishment.²

Quietly, some school boards faced with empty classrooms and underused but tenured teachers have already started putting pre-kindergarten youngsters in modified nursery school curricula. In a survey conducted by the New Jersey State Department of Education in February 1975 it found that 5,131 pupils in 356 classes were participating in such programs throughout the state.³ Most of these classes were financed with special funds available for compensatory programs and for the education of the handicapped; but 1,327 four-year-olds in the state, in such communities as Orange and Harrison, were attending pre-kindergarten classes funded as part of regular local school budgets.

— The falling birth rate has made a very real difference in the socialization patterns of young children. This is especially true in middle-class suburbs which have led the trend toward smaller families and where population density is relatively low. The once common sight of baby carriages on the lawns, and swarms of toddlers at play in the tree-lined streets on a sunny afternoon has almost disappeared from our social landscape in the past few years. More typically, the suburban pre-schooler

finds few playmates nearby. Arranging social experiences with her offspring's peers is now a demanding skill for many a mother. They often look to organized pre-school programs to provide the social contacts that used to be available as a matter of course to the suburban children of earlier years.

- - - Feminist aspirations of finding fulfillment outside the home have made mothers impatient with protracted child care. Many are eager to enroll their children in programs that will allow them to pursue personal interests. In 1965, about sixty per cent of the nation's children were attending kindergarten, where enrollment is optional.⁴ By 1973, this figure was up to seventy-six per cent.⁵ In New Jersey, ninety-nine per cent of the school districts now provide kindergarten instruction to those who want it, and just about everyone seems to want it. In 1974, 101,219 children attended kindergarten in public schools while only 99,508 were enrolled in first grade.⁶ (This apparent anomaly is partly explained by the lack of kindergarten classes in parochial schools that siphon off children in the first grade.)

- - - The highly publicized work of cognitive psychologists has shown that pre-school children can be taught skills that were formerly thought to be the province of the elementary schools. Starting out as compensatory programs in reading readiness for disadvantaged youngsters, some projects have taken their charges farther and instructed them in reading and arithmetic with good results. The public has been taken with these achievements, and is looking to early education not only as a solution to the learning problems of deprived children, but also to stem the declining literacy that has been noted across the board.

IT IS CLEARLY possible to teach the three Rs to children below the first grade. Educators Carl Bereiter and Siegfried Englemann have developed a much-discussed method of highly structured drills that allow children very little time for play. The children apparently enjoy mastering concepts in incremental steps and learn discipline along with reading and arithmetic. The less-structured approach of the Italian educator-physician Maria Montessori, using sandpapered letter blocks that appeal to the sense of touch as well as to the eye, is also reputed to promote reading in young children, though this seems to work better with consistently pronounced Italian sounds than with the erratic spelling of English.

The question is no longer whether it is possible to teach a modicum of the three Rs to very young children, but whether there is much point in investing a lot of effort in such an educational enterprise. An in-joke among psychologists pondering this question is that "there is no market for four-year-old readers." By age ten or eleven, children of normal abilities who did not master reading until they were eight are no worse off than those who learned at four. The "Integrated Maturity Level" of the older child permits him to internalize and apply his literacy more quickly and independently, and to bridge any knowledge gap with relative ease.

A decision to push for an earlier start on academic education has serious implications for the standard elementary school curriculum. As things stand now, kindergarten and first grade teachers are far from pleased with pupils who have been taught reading prematurely. In our own survey of New Jersey day care centers, several directors noted that they shied away from too much emphasis on academics at the

request of local kindergarten teachers, who feel that the time is better spent developing artistic creativity, good social attitudes and greater independence in dressing and grooming. Without some correlation between what is taught in day care centers and in the public schools, children who have been given intensive academic preparation in pre-school programs are released into standard kindergartens where they repeat what they already have learned. Even first grade may mean a repetition of previous material. If academically oriented pre-school education is to become the norm, kindergarten and first grade instruction must be drastically overhauled. Changes, in fact, may have to be made in the entire twelve-year elementary curriculum.

A new approach might be to combine the academic content of kindergarten, first and second grades into a two-year program, a step that could at least be tried on an experimental basis. The problem here, of course, is what to do with the year thus gained. One can predict that the teachers' unions, eager to have access to children at younger ages, will not be equally thrilled at the prospect of losing them a year earlier. Nor does the job market offer much hope for students graduating from high school a year earlier. Yet such a move may well make sense by easing the tedium of repetitive work at the school entry level, and by reducing the drop-out rate among high school students at the exit level. It would also offset the cost of the pre-school program by saving the expense of a year of elementary schooling.

Changes in the entire elementary curriculum or in the job market for teenagers are vast indeed; they may seem too much to undertake just to make sense out of academic training for four-year-olds. But such changes are implied in a program that starts children in school at the age of three or four. Otherwise, pre-school academic training becomes an expensive venture to no purpose. In fact, it could do harm by raising the level of boredom in the early years of school.

THE MORE PREVALENT pre-school programs are still the traditional ones derived from nursery school philosophies. They avoid conscious and concentrated efforts to teach young children specific academic skills. They give children an interesting environment and the freedom to explore it under sympathetic guidance.

However, an increasing body of research shows that disadvantaged children in highly structured, cognitive-oriented programs have consistently tested better when compared with control groups from similar backgrounds who had more general "developmental" experiences,⁷ or who had not attended any early childhood programs. This should not be surprising, since the tests are designed specifically to measure cognitive gains. It is as yet uncertain whether these gains are more likely to be maintained in later years than those posted by pre-schoolers in less structured programs, where the results tend to dissipate in the early elementary grades. It is reasonable to assume that a challenging elementary curriculum built upon the pre-school learning (rather than merely repeating it) could indeed reinforce the learning techniques and discipline acquired earlier and achieve more lasting results. At least for children from culturally and economically deprived homes, programs emphasizing language and concept mastery seem more promising, and have received strong encouragement from highly respected child psychologists.⁸

Most education directors, including those schooled in traditional early childhood

pedagogy, now acknowledge the popularity of the structured curriculum emphasizing the three Rs. They are opting for programs that attempt to combine the development of the "whole child" with an exposure to reading readiness and language enrichment.

ASIDE FROM THE squabbles about the content of early childhood education, no consensus exists regarding who is to teach whatever it is that needs to be taught. Should it be college-trained and certificated personnel within the public school establishment? Should it be non-degreed, experienced child care assistants, at day care centers and in nursery schools? Should it be television, through programs a la *Sesame Street*? Should it be mothers, at home?

To middle-class people, this last question must seem absurd. The role of the mother as the most powerful teaching resource in the lives of middle-class children appears self-evident. The children may eventually benefit from other teaching influences, but these remain supplemental to the basic values and abilities developed in the home.

But for hundreds of thousands of poor children, the influences of the mother and of the home have failed to form a system of values and abilities needed to succeed in the mainstream of American society today. As we found out during our Great Society ventures, poor nutrition is not due solely to lack of food, but also to parental inattention to the requirements of a balanced diet. Even where health care is available and free of cost, for example through Medicaid and baby keep-well stations, poor children do not always get routine follow-ups and immunizations. Play is relegated to an unimportant childhood pastime; of no interest to adults, and is not seized on as valuable parent-child interactions that lead to significant learning. (These things sometimes happen in middle-class homes, too, but not to the same extent).

It is true, as professionals who work with disadvantaged children have repeatedly pointed out, that these youngsters show inherent cleverness and are often remarkably street-wise at a very early age. These skills may help a child survive in a difficult environment, but in psychoanalytic terms, it seems likely that street-wisdom born out of premature exposure to the harsher realities of living bypasses vital stages in emotional development and harms the ability to sublimate, so needed for disciplined learning.⁹ The loss of innocence interferes with the acquisition of academic skills upon which success depends so heavily in our society.

Early efforts at improving the chances of disadvantaged children were primarily designed to remove the youngster from the home situation, at least for part of the day. The Head Start program took over the job of improving nutrition by serving good supplemental meals, of health care by assuming responsibility for check-ups, and of stimulating the child's perceptions through enriching experiences. Parental control and involvement were key phrases in the programs, but they really had no application except at the political level.

More recently, child development professionals have turned to the home, no matter how poor or culturally backward, and to the mother, no matter how uneducated or even disinterested, as the proper target for intervention. Many programs

now send early childhood assistants into these homes on a regular basis to work with mothers, demonstrating toys, suggesting games, and generally trying to plant the idea that being a parent involves more than mere caretaking. On a very practical plane, these frequent visitors help the mother with budgets, menu planning, home safety arrangements and finding appropriate health care. The idea is to avoid doing things on behalf of the mothers. Instead, they encourage the mother to take a more active role in the education of her children and to create a more interesting environment for herself and her family.

There are several reasons for such refocusing on the child's home:

- - - Research findings that point to late infancy and the toddler periods as the most critical stages in determining educational and social outcomes.
- - - The failure of center-based programs for three-to-five-year-olds to produce lasting gains.
- - - The high costs of out-of-home programs, which involve transportation, rentals, and large staffs. Sending child development personnel into the home to work with the mother holds out the further promise of spill-over benefits for the other children in the family, without added cost of effort.

Since 1972, Head Start has been sponsoring a home-based demonstration project known as Home Start designed "to enhance the quality of children's lives by building upon existing family strengths and by emphasizing the role of parents as the first and most important influence in the growth and development of their own children."¹⁰ Interim evaluations of the project by outside specialists conclude that there is "convincing evidence that a parent-focused, home-based child development program can be a viable alternative delivery system producing outcomes at least comparable to those of Head Start children."¹¹

The concept of home visits, starting in the infancy of the child, has also brought favorable responses from others. The Essex County Chapter of the New Jersey Association for Retarded Children operates a "Home Management" program serving forty-six retarded infants in their homes. Trained home care workers informally teach the mothers techniques that enhance development and minimize handicaps. They also comfort and counsel the frequently discouraged parents. In the opinion of Daniel J. Leahy, the association's program director, this is the most productive and cost-effective project ever undertaken in the field of retardation, and requests for services far outpace available capacity. Yet the program's financial fate is uncertain.¹²

The Children's Center at Syracuse University has a Home Visitation program under study that indicates there may be value in starting even earlier. In one of the program variations, para-professional Child Development Trainers (titles for this function are indeed legion) were sent into the homes of mothers-to-be in the sixth month of pregnancy. Guidance started with nutrition, medical follow-ups and basic infant care, then shifted to developmental stimulation. On cognition tests given to the infants at the age of six months, they scored significantly higher than a similar control group whose mothers had not received pre-natal visits.¹³

Other variations are being tried experimentally. The Brookline Early Education Project in Massachusetts has received much publicity, though results are not yet

available. The project differs from the others in that it deals primarily with a white, middle-class population. It features a resource center where parents can obtain reliable information and a series of thorough screenings for potential developmental lags. Monthly visits from a Teacher-Consultant are also offered to some parents.¹⁴

Home visitation projects which place the "visitor" in the role of a knowledgeable friend of the family and which focus upon the routine interactions of the mother and child are a promising addition to the repertoire of early childhood interventions with disadvantaged families, and could perhaps be adapted to wider use. Nevertheless, they are no panacea. There is reason to suspect that their success is heightened through a process of selection, whereby only the more cooperative mothers will take part in them. Unfortunately, there are children born into economic and cultural poverty who are, in addition, burdened with mothers so suspicious, hostile and disengaged as to foil any attempt at involvement. These mothers are likely not to be at home when visits are scheduled, and even to move without forwarding addresses when they feel pressured to participate. Such families are quickly dropped by program intake workers.

Early childhood education directed at parents can of course be started earlier – even before the responsibilities of parenthood begin. There is hope that many wrong-doings by immature and unprepared parents can be avoided by including classes in child development in the public schools. One such curriculum, a joint project by the Office of Child Development and the Office of Education known as "Exploring Childhood," is now offered in more than 1,100 schools and 350 colleges, and has been adapted for use by such voluntary youth service organizations as scouts and 4-H Clubs. Students in grades seven to twelve have been exposed to its contents, which combine classroom lectures with "rap" sessions and part-time field work in child care. The courses have attracted teen-aged boys as well as girls, but they are taken as electives and reach only a small number of students.

Television continues to be a powerful if devious influence in teaching children about the adult world and adults about children. With few exceptions, the medium has failed to perceive the public obligations of this role. The exceptions – programs like *Sesame Street* and the *Electric Company* – have imparted pleasurable learning to their devotees. But from these we are just beginning to realize one can't simply plunk down a youngster in front of the T.V. screen, no matter how well-designed the presentation, and expect miracles. The interest of a caring adult remains a key ingredient in the learning process.

Totally lacking still are television programs geared to the need of parents for useful information and guidance in raising children. Like *Sesame Street*, such programming would have to be under non-commercial sponsorship to avoid becoming captive to special interests. Conceivably, these could become important adjuncts in parental education.

PREDICTING THE FUTURE of early childhood education is a risky task. It may be safe to speculate that this is an area in which growth can be expected, and that warring ideologies and conflicting interests will continue to dominate the field. This is probably not as bad as it sounds, for there is wisdom in Sheldon White's

admonition that the weakness and inconclusiveness of present research data should keep us from overcommitment to any one theory of intervention.¹⁵

Because of the historic emphasis on day care programs for the poor, there is occasionally a tendency to forget the child above the poverty line, who finds himself in growing social isolation because of the declining birth rate. The empty classrooms accruing in suburban schools are a natural place for the expansion of early childhood services for children above the poverty line. Part-time, voluntary after-school and pre-kindergarten programs in school buildings would make sense, if they do not fall prey to the narrow and expensive strictures of the regular school curricula.

To be effective, early childhood education must be cumulative in its impact. It must reach all members of society at significant stages of the life cycle. It must include education in the business of being a parent as well as opportunities for young children, especially those who are handicapped or otherwise burdened with risk of future liabilities.

Notes--Chapter 3

- ¹Raymond S. and Dorothy N. Moore, *Better Late Than Early*. Reader's Digest Press, 1975.
- ²John Mathews, "Day Care: What Role for Public Schools?" *Compact*, The Bimonthly Magazine of the Education Commission of the States, Vol. IX, No. 3, June 1975, p. 19.
- ³State of New Jersey, Department of Education, "Pre-Kindergarten Programs by Funding Source in N.J. Public School Districts," February 1975.
- ⁴Maya Pines, *Revolution in Learning*, Harper & Row, 1966, p. 35.
- ⁵*Child Care Data and Materials*, op. cit., p. 67.
- ⁶Figures obtained from the New Jersey Department of Education, Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation.
- ⁷Miller, Louise and Dyer, Jean, *Experimental Variations of Head Start Curricula: A comparison of Current Approaches*, May 1970. Available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, POB Drawer O, Bethesda, Maryland, 20014 as EDO 45196.
- ⁸See Urie Bronfenbrenner, *A Report on Longitudinal Evaluations of Pre School Programs*, volume II, "Is Early Intervention Effective?" Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Publication N. (OHD) 74-25, p. 52.
- ⁹For a discussion of this theory, see for example, Norman Cameron, *Personality Development and Psychopathology: A Dynamic Approach*, Houghton Mifflin, Co., 1963, p. 82, p. 245.
- ¹⁰"The Home Start Evaluation: Highlights of Findings" - Excerpted and abstracted by the Office of Child Development from *National Home Start Evaluation: Interim Report V, Executive Summary*, High Scope Educational Research Foundation and Abt Associates, Inc., October 15, 1974.
- ¹¹*Ibid.*
- ¹²For program description, see *Home Management: Care for the Homebound Retarded Infant and Child*, Essex Unit, N.J.A.R.C. 62 North Walnut Street, East Orange, N.J.
- ¹³J. Ronald Lally and John A. Maurelli, "The Effects of a Home-Visitation Program on the Development of Disadvantaged Infants during the First Six Months of Life" Paper presented at meeting of the Early Childhood Committee, American Public Health Association, Atlantic City, November 12-16, 1972.
- ¹⁴Maya Pines, "Head Head Start", *The New York Times*, October 26, 1975.
- ¹⁵*Federal Programs for Young Children*, Volume III - op cit.

The Costs of Day Care

"Day care should be available to every family as a public library in any suburban community."

"Cost is the problem. I feel some agency ought to help pay the fee for my two children or get the center to lower its charges."

Responses from working mothers in *Windows on Day Care* by Mary Dublin Keyserling.

FROM TIME IMMEMORIAL mothers have nurtured their young without expectation of payment. Entrusted with the serious job of molding the new generation, mothers were not expected to perform any duties outside their households. They were entitled to support and protection from their mates, and from society in their absence. Mothering was recognized as a difficult task which had its rewards not in material compensation but in personal satisfaction and society's approval.

When we consider the cost of day care we are really trying to establish the worth, in dollars and cents, of those services once provided by mothers for free. We are learning that when mothers are no longer satisfied with their nurturing role and withdraw their free services, the cost of attempted replacement can be very high indeed. Mothers find that they cannot replace themselves adequately in the lives of their children on the wages earned in their non-mothering pursuits. They call upon "some agency" to pay for better mother-substitutes. By default, that "agency" usually turns out to be the state.

The true costs of day care remain elusive, despite many studies that have examined the subject. Several of these have attained the status of classics in the field, and are quoted in all the literature on the subject. These are:

... a study published in 1967, prepared by the Office of Child Development which produced these annual cost figures:¹

	Minimum	Acceptable	Desirable
Day Care Center (preschool)	\$1,245	\$1,862	\$2,320
Family Day Care (ages 0-6)	1,423	2,032	2,372
Before and after school and summer	310	653	653

The definition of minimum quality is "the level essential to maintain the health and safety of the child, but with relatively little attention to his developmental needs." Acceptable care includes a "basic program of developmental activities as well as providing minimum custodial care." Desirable care includes "the full range of general and specialized developmental activities suitable to individualized development."²

A startling conclusion from this study is that family day care, at any level, is more expensive than center care.

A follow-up study for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, based on 1972 data, holds further surprises. No quality differentiations were made, but despite inflation, the cost of pre-kindergarten center-based care was down to \$1,702 a year, and family day care was reduced to \$1,455. Obviously, different methods were used in these calculations.

... a survey of center and family day care homes, conducted by the Westinghouse Learning Corporation in 1970 for the Office of Economic Opportunity, presented these costs:

For Type A day care (custodial):	\$ 324
For Type B (with educational component)	540
For Type C (developmental)	54 1 368

--- an oft-quoted survey of costs in twenty "good" day care centers was undertaken by Abt Associates in the early 1970's. An interesting aspect of this study is that it measured costs not on the usual basis of enrollment, but instead used average daily attendance. Since no savings accrue when a child is absent, the costs are higher when actual attendance is used. The average cost per child was found to be \$2,349 a year.

--- another study prepared in 1972 by the Inner City Fund also made cost calculations for center underutilization and derived these figures:

	Full enrollment	80% capacity enrollment
Infants	\$2,868	\$3,538
Toddlers	2,551	3,142
Pre-school	1,546	1,887

It is impossible to draw meaningful conclusions from such data, as the studies seem to be measuring different things, in different locations and at different times. None of them tells us what it is that children get at the high-priced centers that they do not get at the lower-priced facilities.

Costs vary greatly by region. They are lowest in the South and highest in the Northeast. They are susceptible to rapid escalation when facilities are underused, when absenteeism is allowed to burgeon. They are extremely sensitive to any changes in the ratios of staff to number of children, and to the formal credentials mandated for staff members.

A complication in trying to establish realistic cost estimates is the problem presented by the goods and services donated to a center. Most centers attract some gifts of merchandise. Part-time volunteers help in the office, assist in the classroom, or organize fund drives. Some of the volunteers are highly trained professionals who donate time that would be very expensive to buy. Many centers also use students from high schools and colleges to help out. One could argue that since unpaid volunteers are traditionally part of day care operations, they can be disregarded in cost comparisons. But this argument can't be stretched to cover employees who are placed in the centers as part of publicly sponsored manpower training programs, in the expectation that they will learn useful skills and ultimately get paid employment on their own. The salaries of the trainees are derived from tax-supported sources and are a public cost, whether the heading is child care or manpower training. The value of the subsidized food provided by the Department of Agriculture under the terms of the Child Nutrition Act is another sizeable public contribution that must be taken into account in comparing the real cost of day care programs.

The range of costs reported for various day care operations far exceeds the differences within and between the studies we have cited.

In looking for extreme examples, we found reference to the Elmont, N.Y. Day Care Center, administered by Nassau County's Day Care Service Division. In July 1974, costs there were running \$174.55 per child, per week - or \$9,076.60 annually! One assumes that at this price it was a super-developmental facility, but

the director of the county agency, when made aware of the costs, commented, "There is a limited amount that a child can absorb from day care educational programs. No matter how much education the teacher has. . . the child can only absorb so much." The center was shut down shortly after its *modus operandi* was disclosed in the press.³

In searching for bargains, the average day care center cost in North Carolina, as reported in a study published in 1974,⁴ seemed to fit the bill - \$74 per month.

Up the Staff

IN 1974 CONGRESS took action to raise the minimum size of day care center staffs specified in the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements of 1968. The 1968 regulations had left center staffing ratios for children under three years old to conform with state licensing laws. The 1974 revisions stipulated a ratio of one staff member for each infant under six weeks old, and one staff member for every four toddlers between six weeks and three years old. Children aged three to four were to have one staff person for seven youngsters. Only those staffers working directly with the children were to be considered in ratio calculations. The new regulations also demanded stricter compliance with each state's minimum health and safety codes.

These changes were initially to go into effect in October 1975. In states that had previously required less stringent adult-child ratios the new law promised to create real hardship. Day care costs are largely determined by staffing patterns, with seventy to eighty per cent of all expenditures going into salaries and staff benefits. The states argued that without more money from Washington they would be faced with a sizeable increase in their day care budgets, or alternatively, with the necessity of closing some centers in order to meet requirements at others.

These directives were greeted with dismay by day care providers, including those of for-profit operations that had contracts to sell some slots to the states and now had to meet higher standards for all children in attendance, including those enrolled privately. Enforcement of the new regulations was first postponed till February 1976, then till July 1976, while a bill was introduced allocating another \$250 million per year to the states, and allowing special tax benefits for private centers hiring welfare recipients to fill the additional staff positions.

In states such as New Jersey, where licensing enforcement had been vigorous for some time and staffing was already in step with the new rules, little of the new money would have gone into upgrading existing facilities; most of it was eagerly awaited for further expansion of services.

A bill allocating \$125 million for the remainder of fiscal 1976 passed both houses in January 1976. President Ford expressed his displeasure with it. He voiced his preference for block grants for social services that would allow the states to spend them with minimal dictates from Washington. He was also reluctant to exceed the two-and-a-half billion dollar ceiling for social services that had held since 1972.

In April, the President vetoed the \$125 million day care appropriation, declaring that he is "opposed to unwarranted federal interference in states' administration of these programs." The attempt to override the veto handily cleared the House, but

failed by three votes in the Senate. The net effect of that action was to reinstate the October 1975 deadline for compliance with the higher staffing ratios. Ironically, President Ford's unwillingness to impose federal standards on the states resulted in this instance in the worst of both policies for the states -- the imposition of costly, inflexible rules without any federal financial help to meet them.

In his veto message, President Ford had also pointed out that the \$125 million appropriation would not make day care services more readily available, but would only make them more expensive. In states where previous regulations had permitted more children per caretaker, this would indeed have been the case.

Shortly after the Senate sustained the presidential veto, an article in the *New York Times*⁵ purported to illustrate the hardships faced by day care centers in the wake of the loss of further appropriations. Somewhat unintentionally, the article also illustrated how high-priced a service day care could become and the press' unquestioning acceptance of the slogans of the day care community.

The article discussed the situation at five centers in Chicago, operated under the aegis of the Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church: "Teachers, parents, staff members and child care officials were apprehensive and bitter over what they saw as the threat to the survival of centers such as Bethel's. . ." and further, "We will not be able to provide the services we need, we will not be able to serve this community. . .," according to the pastor of the church, the Reverend D. C. Coleman.

Mr. Coleman provided the information that 220 children attended the five centers, which received \$750,000 in federal funds, and operated with a staff of seventy-five, including eleven teachers. The problem at the Bethel centers was that eleven teachers for 220 children represents a teacher-child ratio of one-to-twenty, and under the new rules many more teachers would have to be engaged.

From what we know of the federal support formula, a grant of \$750,000 must be matched with \$250,000 in locally raised funds, adding up to a total program budget of \$1,000,000. If the newspaper's figures are accurate, the yearly per capita cost of the Bethel program was:

$$1,000,000/220 = \$4,545 \text{ or } \$87.40 \text{ per week for each child enrolled --}$$

and that for one adult in charge of twenty youngsters! This arithmetic raises questions as to just what it was that the other sixty-five staff members were doing, since they were not caring for the children, and why many of them could not be reassigned to classroom duties without further infusions of tax dollars.⁶

And finally there is this astounding quotation in the *New York Times* article:

"If the guidelines are now enforced, centers such as Bethel will have to curtail their programs sharply, and thus become 'nothing more than baby-sitting operations,' said Sandra Bernstein. . . 'We will never allow that to happen. . . we will not become a baby-sitting service.'"

If this lament were to be taken seriously, it would mean that with one teacher in charge of twenty children, the existing service was *not* a baby-sitting operation, but under the new rules that mandated fewer children per adult caretaker, it was about to become one! And somehow, this was all because \$4,545 yearly per child was insufficient. . .

The Big Apple: How the Worm Got In

ANY EXAMINATION of day care costs calls for a look at New York City, whose fiscal woes have been page one national news for the past two years, and whose social service programs -- including day care -- have been implicated as contributing to its financial plights.

New York City is the spiritual Mecca of the day care movement. It has a history of child care programs for the benefit of working mothers going back to the middle of the 19th century, of civic activism on behalf of the day care cause that traces back to the World War II period, and of municipal support that is unique in the nation.

In the early 1940's, when the Depression-spawned Works Progress Administration centers were scheduled to close, organized pressure from citizen groups succeeded in negotiating a takeover formula for continued operations that provided for equal payments from the state, the city, and the parents. At the end of World War II, Governor Thomas E. Dewey appointed a commission to review the state's involvement in day care, and acted upon its recommendation to end state support for the program. This brought forth a storm of protest, of the kind that has become traditional in every New York City day care funding crisis. In turn this resulted in a complete takeover by the city of the state's share and the creation of a Division of Day Care within the City's Department of Welfare.

Until the mid-1960's, day care remained a small program, though one of symbolic importance, since no other city had taken New York's course. In the 1967 fiscal year, it operated on a budget of \$8.25 million. With the arrival of the Great Society and its anti-poverty programs, the ready availability of federal monies for day care and the election of Mayor John Lindsay -- a liberal committed to large-scale social service spending -- day care expenditures mushroomed. In 1969, the city day care budget was \$13.8 million; in 1970, \$22.4 million; in 1973, it rose to \$124 million. In the fall of 1975, faced with the necessity of cutting back under the threat of imminent default on its debts, the City's Bureau of the Budget was using a "realistic" \$170 million budget figure that it hoped to trim down to \$156 million, and even to \$149 million in a full austerity contingency. The anticipated 1977 fiscal year budget was \$140.2 million, reflecting the perceived need for a drastic program review. By May 1976, the acting director of the Agency for Child Development was speaking of a City allocation of only \$116.2 million for the coming year that would have to be supplemented by \$10 million from other sources, presumably through a serious attempt to charge and to collect stiffer fees from parents. He also made it known that despite cutbacks and intended fiscal reform, City day care spending in 1975 had actually proceeded at the rate of \$165 million.

In the late 1960s the money pouring in from Washington under the provisions of

Title IV-A of the Social Security Act was available to cover 75 per cent of all day care expenditures. The other 25 per cent was divided equally between the state and the City of New York. This is in striking contrast to New Jersey, where the state soon took the position of limiting its role in community day care to that of administrative overseer and unloaded the job of raising the 25 per cent required match on the day care centers themselves. To the City of New York, however, paying 12.5 cents on the dollar seemed a bargain, a welcome relief from its former almost total support of day care expenditures.

In June 1969, the Citizens Budget Commission released a report entitled *Day Care: The Case for Prompt Expansion* that stressed the function of day care in getting mothers into jobs and off welfare. Mayor Lindsay appointed a Task Force on Early Childhood Development to bring direction to this contemplated expansion. Their report, entitled *The Children Are Waiting*, came out in July 1970 and set the philosophic tone for what was ahead. The introductory statement reads: "... every child, regardless of his economic, social or family background, has a right to the advantages of an enriched preschool experience, including a range of health, educational and social services" and that "no mother should be forced to work as a condition for using early childhood services."⁸

The report also recommended the removal of the Division of Day Care from the Department of Social Services, and the creation of a special department for early childhood programs within the City's Human Resources Administration. This was done in July 1971, when the Agency for Child Development (ACD) was formed. It was headed by the former staff director of the Task Force, Ms. Georgia McMurray, who was given the rank of Commissioner.

Living up to its reputation as a bastion of liberal human concern and of fiscal nonchalance, New York built a day care system that in its search for excellence exceeded federal and state standards in staff ratios and credentials. It was lavish in the use of non-teaching personnel - full-time bookkeepers, janitors, family counselors with vague duties beyond intake, a procedure then duplicated at the ACD Central Office. In a city of prohibitive rentals and hard-to-come-by outdoor space, it also surpassed specified norms for indoor and outdoor space. Expensive twenty-year leases were signed with rapacious landlords and in the wake of drastic cutbacks and center closings, these remain a financial albatross for the city. According to a source close to the Bureau of the Budget, yearly rental costs of \$1,000 per child per year were common in the newer centers.

Community day care staffs unionized and though they were employed by the sponsoring community agencies, the City of New York was made to contribute to their pension funds. Eligibility for day care services were expanded beyond the state guidelines, so that a wider range of children qualified for subsidized care in the City than in any other community in the state. Permissible deductions from earnings were figured so generously that the fee system instituted for parents at the higher income levels was practically inoperative.

While all this was happening, the ACD was so busy with expansion plans that the centers already in existence received scant attention. Operating on a budget of \$4 million, with a central office staff of nearly 400 and a field staff of about 250,

the agency personnel structure was weak in administration and heavy in "technical" expertise. Despite its size, it could not keep reins on what was going on at the service delivery level.

By 1972, all signs pointed to the drying up of federal largesse. Nevertheless, the expansionist momentum carried expenditures to greater heights. The State of New York repeatedly attempted to impose compliance with its guidelines. Each move was greeted by organized parent demonstrations and lengthy official procrastination in recertifying eligibles according to more restrictive state regulations and in meeting minimum licensing standards. Failure to meet deadlines for filing claims resulted in losses of millions of dollars in state and federal refunds for the city. By March 1975, Mayor Abraham Beame talked openly of closing some centers and consolidating staffs, in view of the city's deteriorating financial situation. By the end of the year, the decision to stop supporting twenty-eight day care centers was announced.

In February 1976, the state promulgated a tough policy that disallowed any reimbursements for care at substandard unlicensed facilities, and set a maximum repayment rate of sixty-five dollars per child per week, though average program costs were running at seventy-two to seventy-eight dollars per week in the City. In May, the acting director of the ACD announced that the city would stop financing forty-nine more centers.

Some interesting insights into the operations of New York City day care centers are revealed in a survey of ninety centers conducted by the Day Care Council of New York in January 1974.⁹ The council is a coordinating and advocacy body that is a descendant of the citizen groups active in the 1940s in promoting subsidized day care in New York City. Its credentials as a champion of the cause of subsidized community day care are impeccable.

The Council disclosed average weekly costs per child in January 1974 of \$71.74 in the older centers, \$73.70 in the newer centers, and \$79.35 in "interim" centers — a category of facilities operating on temporary licenses because of basic deficiencies. It also found attendance rates of seventy-three per cent in the after-school programs. It was openly skeptical of the eighty-five per cent attendance claimed by directors in pre-school programs — rightly so, in view of ACD records indicating only eighty per cent attendance, and critics within the City's fiscal control units who believe it was actually much lower.

Though the 1969 report of the Citizens Budget Commission emphasized day care as the enabling mechanism for allowing mothers to work, the council reported that in thirty per cent of the centers, fewer than half the mothers worked. Overall, in the centers surveyed, fifty-five per cent of the family heads were unemployed, and eighteen per cent were looking for work. It seems reasonable to assume that this situation worsened during the economic recession and high unemployment that prevailed later.

The council found after-school facilities grossly underused and concluded that "children aged eight or older may resent coming back to centers." It was somewhat vague regarding its findings on under-use of pre-school centers, but related that at least seven per cent had no waiting lists and presumably had openings. Under-use was known to be a problem, partly because in the City's expansion phase little

planning was done to assure geographic balance and some areas had a surplus of day care center slots.

An important conclusion from this survey, by a group not open to accusations of anti-day care sentiment, was that "... the centers considered to be offering the best quality or good care had, on the average, lower budgeted per capita weekly costs. . . than those rendering fair or poor care." In effect, the council reported a strong negative correlation between costs and quality. This finding has been affirmed in other cost-quality studies.

In many ways then, New York City showed the rest of the nation what might be expected when day care programs multiply explosively, guided by no policy except "the more the better." Disregard of costs did not improve the quality of the programs but did use up money faster than was necessary and than the City could afford. High-minded intent was no substitute for fiscal integrity. The backlash resulting from well-publicized waste may ultimately deprive needy New Yorkers from truly essential services.

Some Speculations on Costs of "Universal" Day Care

NEW YORK CITY, of course, never came close to providing subsidized universal day care, though it strove mightily. The call for "universal, free, comprehensive child care services" has been muted lately, due to the stringent and overwhelming fiscal constraints experienced by governments at all levels, but it is sure to be heard again.

We have therefore speculated on what the costs of service provisions might be, in a state like New Jersey, where expenditures so far have remained within bounds and authoritative estimates of needs are available from James Kagen, the director of the New Jersey Division of Youth and Family Services.

In his testimony at public hearings on day care held by the State Assembly Committee on Institutions, Health and Welfare in February 1975, Kagen stated the magnitude of the unmet need: by adding the number of children under six who are welfare recipients and whose mothers are at home, to the number of children in that age group whose mothers (on or off welfare) are in the labor force, and deducting from that the estimated number of pre-school slots already available, Kagen found 318,065 children under six needing this service. The same method of computation yields a need for 582,272 after-school and summer slots for children aged six to fourteen.

The current maximum reimbursement scales in New Jersey for full-day group programs are fifty dollars per week for pre-school children; seventy dollars per week for infants, and seventy dollars per week for pre-schoolers with handicaps or other special needs. For after-school care, the maximum allowed is twenty-five dollars per week. From our observations, the newer programs are generally granted repayment at or near the top, and it is therefore reasonable to expect that programs now in the planning stages for opening in two to three years will weigh in at the highest authorized rate.⁵

Since the information is not provided in Kagen's estimates, we made some assumptions about the age distribution of the pre-school children in need. We assume, then, the following age profile which takes into account the declining

birth rate in the state:

Age	No. of Children	Per Cent
0-2½	128,000	40
2½-5	136,000	43
5-6	54,065	17
Total Pre-school	318,065	100

Let us further speculate that the children between five and six will be attending kindergarten, and therefore will need only part-time care; and further, that eight per cent of the youngsters aged 2 1/2 - 5 will be diagnosed as handicapped in some way (physically, intellectually, or emotionally) or as having other "special needs." Under these conditions, costs for needed programs would run as follows:

Age	Weekly costs per child	Total annual costs of unmet needs
0-2½	\$70	\$465,920,000
2½-5	10,880 @ \$70	39,603,200
	125,120 @ \$50	325,312,000
5-6	\$25	1,351,625
6-14	\$25	756,953,600
All Children		\$1,589,140,425

To this total of unmet needs, we must add the expenditures for those programs we already have, including the full-day Head Start projects. Total costs, therefore, disregarding probable effects of inflation, are:

Unmet needs	\$1,589,140,425
Current day care programs ¹⁰	47,386,642
Full-day Head Start programs ¹¹	4,259,605

TOTAL **\$1,640,786,672**

It is almost embarrassing at this point to note that at the \$1.6 billion level we would still be short of providing universal services in New Jersey. Kagen's model is composed of children who are on welfare and of those whose mothers are employed. No provision is made here for children above the poverty line whose mothers are not now working. Quite possibly, many mothers might decide to go to work if free or heavily subsidized day care were available; or they might just send their children to a center because of the claimed developmental benefits.

New Jersey's total Title XX allocation of federal funds for social services, under which most of our public day care programs are budgeted, is \$87.75 million for

1976. While increases in this aid category are possible, they are unlikely to be at the scale needed to finance universal day care services. Such a program at the national scale would cost tens of billions of dollars a year.

Day care directors of existing community centers complain that it takes herculean efforts to raise money for the required federal match from private sources, and it is plain enough that philanthropy will not be a source of vast infusions of new money.

The State of New Jersey is already under great pressure to provide a substantial share of the match money needed. It has fought off the pressures more or less successfully until now. With a total budget precariously balanced at \$2.8 billion, the State of New Jersey does not appear to be a good candidate for assuming this \$1.6 billion obligation.

Could New Jersey afford a universal free day care system? The State's own Division of Youth and Family Services has concluded that "meeting all of the need for day care services alone would more than exhaust all available State and Federal social service resources to the neglect of other needed services."¹²

Notes -- Chapter 4

¹ Mary Potter Rowe and Ralph D. Husby, "Economics of Child Care" in *Child Care-Who Cares?*, Pamela Roby, Ed., Basic Books, Inc., New York, 1973, p. 105.

² Ibid.

³ *The New York Times*, "High Costs Vex Day Care Units," June 2, 1974.

⁴ *Who Cares for Children? A Survey of Child Care Services in North Carolina*, Learning Institute of North Carolina, Durham, N.C., April 1974.

⁵ *The New York Times*, "Chicago Day Care Centers Troubled by Veto of Funds," May 10, 1976.

⁶ The Center attempted to obtain verification of the published information from the Bethel administration, without success.

⁷ *The New York Times*, "New York to Halt Aid for 49 Day Care Centers," May 28, 1976.

⁸ *The Children Are Waiting*, Report of the Early Childhood Task Force, New York City, July 20, 1970.

⁹ Mary Dublin Keyserling, Project Director, *New York City Child Care Programs: Challenges Ahead*, Day Care Council of New York, Inc., 205 East 42 Street, New York, New York, 10017.

¹⁰ Estimate for FY 1977 prepared by Peter Erwin.

¹¹ Estimate for FY 1973 - Child Care Data and Materials, op.cit. p. 99.

¹² "Draft Issue Identification Paper on Eligibility Levels and Fees" -- DYFS, October 17, 1975; p.8.

The Benefits of Day Care: Myth and Reality

THE LITERATURE of day care advocacy is full of claimed benefits to be derived from this service. The data base for these assertions is often very soft, but they are nonetheless presented so regularly and with so much conviction that they are often accepted as proven verities.

There are, of course, inherent attractions in a public program which exposes small children to instruction and discipline at the hands of enthusiastic and kindly people in congenial surroundings. Good things must be happening to those children. They must be the better for it, not only now but for the rest of their lives. Our intuition tells us so and we are receptive when more detailed claims are made on behalf of day care. But we have also learned that intuition is not always a sound basis for large-scale government programs. Thus, it may be worthwhile to take a closer look at some of the most frequently claimed benefits of day care programs.

"The committee recommended that "the Federal Government assume the major role in directing and providing for universal voluntary child development programs as a valuable service to parents, as a child's right and as society's obligation to avoid the cost of neglect."

The New York Times, "Child Care Aid is Held Lacking," January 13, 1976.

"... expenditures for day care services which meet quality standards are a public investment which reaps returns over a long period of time. They strengthen family life - an advance which cannot be measured in dollars and cents terms. They enable mothers to take employment, which lowers assistance payments and increases tax revenues. The gains for children and therefore for society, are multiple. In building healthier bodies and preparing children for more effective school entry and social relationships, the lasting benefits of good day care are incalculable."

New York City Child Care Programs: Challenges Ahead, published by the Day Care Council of New York, Inc.

"To the extent that an educational program for young children contributes to their success as students and citizens, it will significantly reduce subsequent remedial, counseling and even penal and welfare costs."

Early Childhood Development: Alternatives for Program Implementation in the States, A report of the Education Commission of the States, June 1971.

"We have the knowledge, means and institutional structure for preventing early damage to children. That institution is "Day Care" . . . Free day care services with trained staff can literally save the child at risk in his home or community and is more cost-effective than the eventual expense of corrective therapy. . . How can we ignore what we know absolutely: . . . This service cannot help but have a positive impact on the delinquency problem. Emotional, neurological or psychological problems can be detected and treated sufficiently early to prevent permanent personality damage . . . Let us begin to attack the delinquency problem where it begins by setting up day care centers truly dedicated to the children who need our care. . ."

Grace W. Sisto, Executive Director, Children's Aid and Adoption Society of New Jersey, "Letter to the Editor," *The New York Times*, October 13, 1974.

"There is no question that the most dire predictions made for years by social scientists have come true. The lack of effective policies and programs for assuring adequate income and necessary services in time, i.e., to the young children in their most formative years, have contributed in large measure to the growing problems among poor children like lead poisoning and sickle cell anemia and mental retardation and other deformities associated with malnutrition. Because we have failed to give priority to prevention it should be no surprise that the cost of corrective and remedial services in prisons, reformatories, mental hospitals, foster homes and treatment centers have mushroomed."

Statement by Dr. Anna B. Mayer, in testimony submitted to the New Jersey Joint Appropriations Committee, at hearings on day care budget, March 12, 1974.

The claims made to justify the demands for day care expansion translate society's fondest hopes into *faits accomplis*. It seems reasonable to assume that a young child who is given good meals, warm and pleasant surroundings, attentive adults to guide him, and is presented with experiences designed to stimulate his curiosity and social growth, will be launched on the path to self-assurance, enjoyment of learning, and good citizenship. From these optimistic assumptions, it is easy to proceed to the next step and speculate about the savings that might be effectuated if indeed the child learns better in school and needs no special remedial instruction, relates better to peers and needs no psychiatric intervention, acquires the abilities necessary for independent living and needs no public assistance, and becomes a better citizen who can make positive contributions to society. Finally, in the next phase these sanguine suppositions are transformed into unequivocal statements that are rarely challenged.

None of these claimed benefits for the subsequent development of individuals has been proven. In fact it is far from certain that the day care experience does not produce some long-term deleterious effects upon children. For one thing, a youngster's need for care from a constant caregiver is denied in most day care settings: turnover in day care staffs is large because the ten to twelve hour day at centers requires several shifts of caregivers, and volunteers and students come and go at their own pace. The child is thus surrounded by many transient adults and his need to form and maintain deep emotional attachments may go unfulfilled. Unfortunately, hard data is unavailable; those places that have the longest history of conducting day care programs (New York City, California) have done no follow-up research on social outcomes. It is only ten years since the launching of Head Start and other compensatory day care programs, too soon for any visible effects on society at large. But certainly the claims of fervent advocates have not been particularly noticeable in the nation's schools.

Again, we are left to conjecture that a child growing up in an abusive and brutalizing home atmosphere is better off spending much of the day away from home, getting good physical care and some adult attention in a day care center. However, it is an equally reasonable conjecture that normal children with interested parents may very well be losing something in a full-time day care center.

Lacking convincing information, it would be prudent to disregard some of the more extravagant promises and to accept as a guiding principle the more cautious summation of Sheldon White that day care of basic adequacy does not harm a child's development, and that it is "probably safe to conclude that on the average, participation in a pre-school program for disadvantaged children does not reduce the children's self-confidence, make them unhappy with themselves or think people dislike them." This is far short of the irrepressible optimism cited earlier, but it does stay within the boundaries of what is known.

The Need for Women in Today's Labor Force

THE STATEMENT that organized group child care frees mothers to join the labor force is one of the most frequently advanced arguments offered on behalf of day care. The statement seems almost self-evidently true. Yet it has its limitations and qualifications.

The usefulness of day care services in freeing women for work outside the home was recognized in World War II. The military mobilization and the machinery of war created a labor shortage which was partially relieved by luring Rosie the Riveter into the factories and placing her little ones in day care centers funded under the Lanham Act.

Though government-subsidized day care went into decline after World War II, women in increased numbers continued to be drawn into the labor market. This trend gained impetus in the 1960s when the American economy became inflated by the manpower demands of a war waged in Southeast Asia and a simultaneous "War on Poverty" conducted at home. Not surprisingly, this era of plentiful employment was also a period during which the women's liberation movement made major strides.

In the mid-seventies, however, the employment situation deteriorated. Unemployment nationally hit a post-Depression high of 8.8 per cent in May 1975. States and local governments were hit hard by the combined effects of inflated costs and dwindling tax revenues. Government hiring, which had been an enormous growth factor in the economy, came to a halt. Hiring freezes and wholesale firings sprung up everywhere.

The situation was worse in some parts of the country than in others. While national unemployment reached a peak of 8.8 per cent of the work force, in New Jersey the unemployment rate hit 13.6 per cent. In the recovery that followed, New Jersey and the New York metropolitan area lagged. Taking a longer view, New York City lost 441,000 jobs between 1969 and 1975¹ and New Jersey forfeited 172,000 jobs in manufacturing alone during the same period.² According to a January 1976 report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, eight populous counties in Northern and Central New Jersey experienced an attrition of 83,000 jobs in 1975.³

Of the many indices that are analyzed and publicized every month, one that portends more trouble ahead has received slight attention: the number of Americans gainfully employed. While unemployment continued to hover at a painful 7.5 per cent nationally, employment was never higher. The implication is that contrary to popular beliefs, the job market had expanded to a point beyond any achieved in history. But the labor supply, swollen by young people from the post-World War II baby boom, by women coming into or rejoining the labor force in ever higher numbers, and the pressure of illegal immigration, has outpaced the economy's ability to accommodate the growing number of job-seekers. Congressman John Conyers Jr., writing in *The New York Times* in January 1976, stated the problem: "To reduce the current 'official' unemployment rate to five per cent by 1985, over 37 million jobs are needed; 8 million for the present jobless, 15

million to accommodate the normal population increases, and 12 million more to compensate for those jobs lost because of technological advances in industry. But over the last ten years, according to 'The 1975 Manpower Report of the President,' only 16.5 million new jobs were created, and most of these were in low-paying industries." Similar concerns have been voiced by Professor Eli Ginzberg of Columbia University, chairman of the National Commission for Manpower Policy: "We're always job-short, not people-short."⁴

In view of this employment picture, which appears to be no temporary phenomenon, the question arises: Does day care free women for work, or for unemployment? Put another way: at a time when millions of people cannot find one job, is it sensible to offer some people two jobs? For indeed, staying home to care for one's little children constitutes genuine employment; it is a full-time job that is socially constructive and personally demanding. It is in fact hard to think of many assignments that parents could undertake which would be more worthy than rearing their own young children. But as the activists of the women's movements are quick to point out, caring for one's own children is a job that carries no financial rewards and is assigned almost exclusively to the mother.

To the extent that mothers are driven to leave the home and go to work because of financial exigence, it might be more helpful to the child, to his family, and to the job-scarce economy to offer the family a cash supplement rather than a slot in a subsidized day care center. A \$100-a-month tax-free supplement would be a significant help to a family with one child and yet would cost the taxpayers less than half the amount required to provide day care services for that family, at the current cost level prevailing in New Jersey. In order to minimize the threat that such assistance would act as an incentive for child-bearing, care would have to be taken to fashion the payment schedule so that it would give no advantage to those who have two children rather than one, or three rather than two. (The same reasoning might be applied in setting fee schedules for partially subsidized day care users. Present philosophy almost always results in lower per capita fee charges for two children than for one, and for three children than for two. This practice creates artificial incentives for day care use and makes no more sense than grading cut-rate prices to those who use a lot of electricity.)

In a really sophisticated model of supplementation, the allocation could truly become a payment for services rendered. Parents receiving such monies (upon application, and based on need) could be asked to take an active role in the child's preparation for an earlier school start, which in the future may very well be advanced to four years of age or even sooner. With the help of special television programs and occasional home visits from child development assistants, the parent at home could become a busy employee in the service of the public good, in return for a payment in public funds. Such a program implies an attempt to strengthen the family to handle new situations rather than by-passing the family with bureaucratic services.

Somewhat similar arguments can be advanced in response to women who demand day care subsidies so that they can continue their professional or other job-related education. Society no longer exerts pressure on women to have children early in the life cycle, before the completion of such studies. Conversely, for those who choose

to have children early, there is no need to hurry the process of formal education because the labor force has no pressing need for the parent as worker. Education pursued part-time or delayed to a more propitious time in the child-rearing process makes a good deal of sense nowadays, for both society and the individual.

It has been argued that organized day care itself is work-intensive, and therefore it should be promoted because it creates jobs. Superficially, this seems quite true. However, even the new Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, in which one person is mandated to care for no more than five children aged three to four, cannot compare in job-creation to the one-to-one or one-to-two ratio of the parent caretaker. The five working mothers whose child care needs create the single day care job must in turn find jobs or join the unemployment rolls. If they find work, they may consign someone else to the ranks of the unemployed.

The truth of the matter is that mothers of young children (or fathers - it matters not which one takes care of the children) are no particular help in a glutted job market, but may be of immense value to their children at home. There may be a number of acceptable reasons for providing day care services, but the needs and opportunities offered by the job market are not among them.

WIN, A Big Loser

IN DISCUSSING the work scene some reference must be made to the experiences of the federal manpower job training programs.

The WIN (Work Incentives) program is the largest such manpower project. It is aimed at helping public assistance recipients to become self-supporting by offering them job training and child care. It became operational in 1968 as a cornerstone in the "workfare, not welfare" policies of the early Nixon administration. The program is a joint effort by the U.S. Labor Department, which administers the job training and placement components, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which is charged with its child care and counseling responsibilities.

On the surface, the rationale for WIN appears disarmingly logical and workable: take adults receiving Aid for Dependent Children (ADC), give them training in useful skills that will make them employable and thus enable them to support themselves and their families. Since by ADC definition, these adults had major child-care responsibilities, they must be relieved of these if they are to train for and hold a job. Funding for child care was therefore provided through the training period and for a few months after the start of paid employment. After that, it was assumed that the gainfully employed mother would be able to make other arrangements for partly subsidized or even privately paid-for care, on her own or with the help of her WIN counselor.

In practice, WIN followed a different path. Enrollees frequently dropped out of training courses when they became disinterested, ill, pregnant, dissatisfied with available day care, or subjected to any of a number of disheartening obstacles. A Task Force on Welfare Management issued a report in June 1971 on the "Work Incentive Program in New Jersey," showing that after two-and-a-half years of operation and 7,700 enrollees, only twenty per cent reached the "job entry phase"

of the program. Since there are definite limitations to what an adult with serious educational deficits, unaccustomed to working, can be taught in a limited period of time, the enrollees were often prepared for low-level jobs that would not pay enough to make them self-supporting. A study of WIN trainees in Chicago documents this: "The most striking finding of the study was that at follow-up seven out of ten respondents were still on Welfare, many on a supplemental basis because of low wages. The goal to reduce Welfare rolls was not attained. Reductions in Welfare cases were not more than normal case load closings."⁵ Another interesting finding was that most of the WIN trainees who did wind up working had in fact already worked before they had enrolled in the program hoping for better jobs; they were, in effect, already able and willing to hold jobs.

In many cases, trainees who completed their courses never managed to find a paid job at all. Sometimes people were encouraged to leave marginal jobs in order to upgrade their skills in a WIN course, and then were unable to get any kind of job again. The following exchange⁶ between New Jersey Assemblywoman Betty Wilson and a day care mother, at legislative hearings on day care - February 18, 1975, poignantly illustrates the situation:

Day Care Mother: I have gone through a WIN program, and I can't get no job. I'm a nurse's aide, and they didn't give me no job yet, and I don't want to go back on welfare. I would rather work.

Wilson: Do you have children in the day care center?

Day Care Mother: Yes.

Wilson: And if you don't get a job, you will have to take your children out of the day care center?

Day Care Mother: Yes. I would like to try to keep it open for the benefit of the other colored people, too, that are out of a job.

Wilson: In the WIN program, once you complete your training, is there an effort to place you in a job?

Day Care Mother: They say they are going to try. I talked to my caseworker last week about it, because I'm ready to go off welfare.

Wilson: How long has it been since you completed your training?

Day Care Mother: I was working at the hospital before, but they wanted me to go back and learn new things in nurse's aide that you have to know before you can go back.

Wilson: You completed the WIN training?

Day Care Mother: No, I have to go back to the WIN program to go through with this again. I went before, but now I have to go back because you have to take temperatures and everything.

Wilson: I see. When did you last finish the WIN training?

Day Care Mother: 1970.

Wilson: 1970. And you have not had a job since then?

Day Care Mother: No.

Wilson: So you were trained, and now you can't get a job.

You haven't had a job in the meantime?

Day Care Mother: No, I have to go back.

Wilson: In order to go back you have to get training again?

Day Care Mother: Yes.

Wilson: But there is no certainty you will get a job?

Day Care Mother: No. I would rather be working.

Wilson: How long has your youngster been in day care?

Day Care Mother: Three months.

Wilson: I see. And during that three months, have you had any assurances that you are going to get a job?

Day Care Mother: Yes, I talked to my caseworker, and he's trying to get me a job.

Wilson: Thank you.

From this interchange it would appear that one unsuccessful training experience was not enough, and another siege was in the making to teach this trainee the secrets of temperature-taking, in order to better prepare her as a nurse's aide, a job category that is now virtually extinct and in which just about no hiring takes place.

In the face of constant setbacks, some changes have been made in the original WIN training concept. WIN II, a revised version, de-emphasizes training courses and makes funds available to employers for hiring WIN participants and giving them on-the-job training. Placement levels have been far from encouraging, but seem to be improving in New Jersey. Unfortunately, they can't be ascertained accurately, since published data is erratic. According to the Annual Report of the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry, fifty-four per cent of WIN enrollees were placed in calendar 1974; yet according to the companion Statistical Appendix, the figure is only forty-three per cent. Both these figures are improvements over calendar 1973 figures, which are either thirty nine per cent or thirty-six per cent, depending on what departmental source one consults for information, and both these percentages are higher than the calendar 1972 placement of thirty-one per cent. Attrition continues on the job, of course. Arnold S. Richter, New Jersey WIN Coordinator, informed us that "of the total number of WIN Placements (including direct placements - those made without the benefit of prior training) about ninety per cent complete at least thirty days on the job. Of those ninety per cent who complete the first thirty days, eighty-eight per cent are still employed after twelve months."⁷

The program has suffered from the dual Labor Department/HEW administration. Budgeting for training and for child care tend to be out-of-phase with one another. At this time, training monies are holding their own, but child care fundings is tightening up. The program is likely to continue on its course, even though little is gained by promising low-paying or non-existent jobs to mothers of young children to lure them away from the job of taking care of their small children at home.

Day Care Saves the Taxpayers Money

For the first time in a long time, Sue Crosby will be paying taxes this year. And she's happy to do it.

Because since the new day care center opened in her neighborhood Sue has earned enough money from her job to plan to buy new furniture for her apartment and new clothes for the kids. Next month she'll have saved enough for a down payment on a car.

But it wasn't always this way. When her husband deserted her and left two small children behind, there was little choice but to go on Welfare.

Today Sue pays her own way. . . thanks to you, she's working.

Advertisement for the United Way campaign,
House Beautiful, July 1975.

SUE, IN THE ABOVE advertisement, is a remarkable young woman. Not only is she happy about having to pay taxes, when so few of us are, but on what must be a very modest salary from her factory job, she not only manages to maintain herself and her two children, but even to buy new furniture and a car and thereby stimulate our entire economy.

One wonders how many readers, perusing the colorful pages of *House Beautiful* and catching a glimpse of the ad showing Sue Crosby diligently at work assembling parts, and taking a moment to read about her heartwarming departure from the welfare rolls, will give further thought to the costs of the Crosby children's day care, and to who pays the tab. The advertisement implies that, somehow, the day care services are essentially run on the contributions of voluntary philanthropy, i.e. the United Way. Readers lucky enough to worry about the beauty of their houses are invited to contribute to Sue's independence through their annual generous donations to the community United Way campaign, which will go toward caring for Sue's little ones along with maintaining the local Boy Scouts troop and the Visiting Nurse Association. It also tacitly suggests that Sue, now enjoying the good life with new clothes, new furniture and a car to boot, is paying a hefty portion of these child care costs herself, perhaps whatever is not covered by the United Way.

The truth is far different. If Sue were a New Jersey resident in 1976, for example, she could earn up to \$10,580 a year and not be asked to contribute a cent toward her children's day care costs. These costs would run about \$2,600 annually per child, or \$5,200 for the two little Crosbys. (We are told that it is a new center. In a previous quotation from the same ad that introduced our section on Early Childhood Education, we saw that it is "developmental" with an emphasis on cognitive learning. From this we can deduce that costs must run at the maximum reimbursement rates allowed in New Jersey.)

No matter where Sue might be living, Federal tax dollars would be picking up seventy-five per cent of her children's day care costs. The United Way contribution

might cover some portion of the other twenty-five per cent, depending on how much other public money states, counties, and municipalities allocate to day care programs in their area. (In New York City, as we have seen, the state and city governments provide the entire twenty-five per cent.) Even when private "match-money" is required, it often comes from such sources as private foundations, not the United Way. Overall, the United Way's financial investment in community day care centers is small. But it has fervently embraced the cause of day care in advertisements such as the one discussed here. It is an indication that day care is a salable program with emotional appeal that opens pocketbooks.

The claim that tax-supported day care saves the taxpayers money by reducing the welfare rolls is made repeatedly, by state officials as well as by day care advocates.

The motives of the day care community in promoting this claim are clear enough. However, state politicians and bureaucrats have additional incentives to promote day care as an alternative to welfare. The states are called upon to pick up a much larger share of welfare expenditures than of day care costs. Washington pays about fifty per cent of welfare costs in a state such as New Jersey but pays seventy-five per cent of the cost of day care programs. In those cases where day care is an essential component of job training (the WIN program), ninety per cent of day care costs are reimbursed by the federal government. Also, in community day care projects, some states, New Jersey among them, have had considerable luck in getting other governmental units and private sources to dish out the needed local match money.

Thus, due to differential federal reimbursement schedules the states do indeed appear to save money when mothers place their children in day care and go to work. To the state and local officials, Washington money seems "free" – and it is, in the sense that they are not held accountable for it. Their object, then, is to "capture" as much of it as possible for state programs. This attitude is reflected in Assemblywoman Betty Wilson's announcement in February 1975 of a public hearing on day care to be held by a New Jersey Assembly committee. Explaining that the state was not taking full advantage of available federal funds, she was quoted as saying "We need a comprehensive state policy to be sure that we receive all possible federal money. In this way, we can increase the number and quality of day care facilities in New Jersey without putting any additional burden on our taxpayers."⁷ Thus it is that federal subsidy programs create competition among the states, stimulating demand based entirely on reimbursement rates.

In order to get a clear understanding of comparative expenditures of public funds for welfare payments and for day care, we have computed the data presented in Table IV. It is based on 1976 New Jersey rates of welfare payments to ADC eligibles, and on the state's allowable day care reimbursements. Our hypothetical family consists of an adult head-of-household and two pre-school children.

DAY CARE

Table IV

Comparative Costs of Welfare Payments and Day Care Costs
for Two Pre-school Children - New Jersey, F.Y. 75-76

Program	Total costs		Fed. share		N.J. share		County, or other govt.		Private contribution	
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
Welfare support payments	3,720	100	1,860	50	1,395	37.5	465 ⁸	12.5		
Day care costs for 2 pre-school children	5,200	100	3,900	75	468 ⁹	9	234	4.5	598 ¹⁰	11.5

In our hypothetical but not improbable case, the taxpayer saves \$927 on his state tax bill, and \$231 on his county bill. But the cost is \$2,040 added to the federal tax bill.

These advantages for the state and county governments hold for other family sizes too, as illustrated in Table IIIa, for an ADC recipient household of one adult and one child, and in Table IIIb, which is calculated for a family of one adult and three children - two of pre-school age and one receiving after-school care. Only in the case of the single-child family is there an actual tax saving, and that occurs only if the parent gets a job good enough to make supplemental welfare benefits unnecessary.

TABLE IVa

Comparative costs of welfare payments and day care costs for one pre-school child - New Jersey, FY 1975-76

PROGRAM	Total costs		Fed share		State share		County or other govt		Private donations	
	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
Welfare support payments	2820	100	1410	50	1057	37	352	12.5		
day care costs for 1 pre-school child	2600	100	1950	75	234	9	117	4.5	299	11.5

DAY CARE

TABLE IVb
Comparative costs of welfare payments and day care costs for three children
(two pre-school, one after-school) - New Jersey, FY 1975-76

	Total costs		Fed share		state share		county or other govt		private donation	
PROGRAM	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%	\$	%
Welfare support payments	4272	100	2136	50	1602	37	534	12		
day care costs for 3 children	6500	100	4875	75	585	9	292	4.5	747	11.5

It is also asserted with great conviction that the parent on welfare, now freed to work through the availability of day care, contributes substantially to society's collective obligations through the payment of taxes. To check the validity of this claim, the extent of this alleged contribution must be looked at analytically, as we do in Table IV, with the following information in mind:

Most mothers who are actual or potential welfare recipients have no marketable skills and typically find low-paying jobs. In Table V, we compare the tax contributions from and the public costs of two hypothetical ADC families with employed heads of households, each family consisting of an adult parent and two pre-school children. In the first instance, the parent earns \$5,200 per year (\$100 per week), which at \$2.50 per hour for a forty-hour week was somewhat above New Jersey's 1976 minimum wage of \$2.20. In the second example, the parent earns \$10,580 per year (\$203.46 per week), which was the maximum gross income at which a family of three could qualify for free day care in New Jersey under the 1976 entitlement schedule for Title XX services. This income limit was due to go higher in the coming year.

Tables Va and Vb present these same calculations for families consisting of one employed parent with one pre-school child attending a community day care center, and of one employed parent with three children, two in full-time community center day care, and one in after-school care.

ADC recipients who take jobs are allowed to keep much of their earned income and still collect part of their welfare checks (and other benefits, such as free Medicaid health insurance, and food stamps) as "supplemental" assistance. In New Jersey, through a system of permissible "deductions" and generous "income disregards" designed to make employment attractive to welfare recipients, it is possible to remain on public assistance even when earning what some would consider a fairly good salary.

TABLE V

Comparison of Tax Contributions from, and Public Costs of Two Families, each with an Employed Head-of-Household and two pre-school children each in Community Day Care Centers - New Jersey, F.Y. 75-76

Gross annual earnings	\$5,200	\$10,580
Federal income tax	200	1,179
Social Security contribution	302	584
State and local taxes	50	255
Total tax contribution	\$552	\$2,018
Public subsidy for day care	4,602	4,602
Supplemental welfare payments	1,713	
Total public costs	\$6,315	\$4,602
Savings to taxpayers	(\$5,763)	(\$2,584)

TABLE Va

Comparison of Tax Contributions from, and Public Costs of Two ADC Families, each with an Employed Head-of-Household and one pre-school child in Community Day Care Center - New Jersey, F.Y. 75-76

Gross annual earnings	\$5200	9840*
Federal income tax	263	1140
Social Security contribution	300	570
State and local taxes	50	265
Total tax contributions	655	1975
Public subsidy for day care	2301	2301
Supplemental welfare payments	876	
Total public costs	3177	2301
Total savings to taxpayers	(2522)	(326)

*Maximum income permissible for two person household to qualify for free day care services under Title XX.

DAY CARE

TABLE Vb

Comparison of Tax Contributions from, and Public Costs of Two ADC Families, each with an Employed Head-of-Household and Three Children (Two in Pre-School Community Day Care, One in After-School Day Care) - New Jersey, F.Y. 75-76

Gross annual earnings	\$5200	12,595*
Federal income tax	88	1384
Social Security contribution	300	630
State and local taxes	27	315
Total tax contributions	415	2329
Public subsidy for day care	5756	5756
Supplemental welfare payments	2153	
Total public costs	7909	5756
Total savings to taxpayers	(7494)	(3427)
*Maximum income possible for 4-person household to qualify for free day care services under Title XX,		

In all of these examples, the public costs of day care (and of supplemental welfare at the lower earning scale) far offset the tax contributions of the wage earners. In the case of one-child families, and of families with one, two or three children earning the maximum allowable for eligibility under Title XX, the overall public costs are somewhat lower than straight welfare income payments (see Total Costs, Tables III, IIIa, IIIb). But there is no great economic imperative for policies that artificially promote the premature employment for single parents of young children, when tax-supported center day care is needed to make employment feasible. The children, the parents and the public might be better served by postponing work until the children reach school age.

The Munificence of Other Nations

"In visiting the countries of Western Europe which have long provided group care for children, we found that adult-child ratios often jump to 20, 30, or 40 or more children per adult. We found this to be particularly true in France as late as 1973. In August 1967, when Dr. Meers interviewed the director of the Hungarian Bureau of Child Care, the director apologized that group child care in Hungary was done strictly as an economic necessity. Every able adult had to work in order to support the economy. But she assured Dr. Meers that it was the intention of the Hungarian government to limit day care as soon as possible. She could not understand why the United States, the richest of nations, would wish to inflict on itself something that Hungary, one of the poorest countries in Europe, was trying to rid itself of.

Meers also found that Czechoslovakia had become concerned enough about the distress of its young children in day care to adopt a policy similar to the one suggested by the Hungarian director. In fact, Czechoslovakian television was actively dissuading its citizens from further placements of young children in pre-school or day care."

From *Better Late Than Early* by Raymond S. and Dorothy N. Moore.

IT IS AN ARTICLE of faith of American social reformers that other industrial nations provide abundant, free and superior day care for their children. Conversely, the United States is depicted as backward, miserly, and uncaring about the welfare of its young.

This kind of statement has to be of limited validity, if it has any truth at all. Comparisons between our country and others with different cultures, values, national aspirations and economic systems are difficult. To the extent that they can be made at all, they yield little to inspire us. In truth, other nations are not nearly as altruistic in their support of early childhood programs, nor are we as laggard, as the vocal day care advocates would have us believe we are.

The Israeli *kibbutz* is often wishfully presented as an ideal child-raising alternative for us to emulate. This collective child-rearing mode arose early in this century when small groups of idealistic young Zionists, bent on reclaiming the barren soil of their ancestral homeland, devised the system as a labor-saving arrangement that would free some of the women for farm work. They also needed every able-bodied individual to defend themselves against hostile Arabs who surrounded them. An ideology of full equality of the sexes as comrades-in-arms and co-workers in the fields took hold and made collective child-rearing a philosophical tenet as well as a necessity.

In these settlements all property was shared and every member made an emotional commitment to dedicate his life to the collective. The children were prized above all else because they represented not only the individual's biologic continuity, but the hope for the perpetuation of the Jewish cultural ethos.

The children, imbued from birth with heavy doses of socialist ideology and blessed with the loving devotion of the entire community, turned out remarkably healthy disciplined and self-assured. But those who advocate *kibbutz*-style child care in America today overlook the fact that the societies are in no way comparable. Americans are extremely mobile and transient. They are not settlers. They are urban people, with no attachment to the soil. There is no shortage of workers in the society, only a shortage of paid work; and the justification for relieving the mother of major child care functions is not the furtherance of the collective good, but on the contrary, to free her to do her own thing. *Kibbutz*-in-America advocates also have not kept up with the changes now sweeping the Israeli original. As agriculture has become more mechanized and conditions less primitive, the *kibbutz* women have been spending more and more time on the upbringing of their children. "Recent surveys show that full two-thirds of the *kibbutz* women—and half of the men—favor abolishing the system of children living apart from their parents. A few *kibbutzim* have already abolished it."¹⁴

China and Russia have a very large proportion of women in their labor forces, and both countries operate large systems of group care for the children of women at work. Both countries are in a frenzy of industrialization, using labor-intensive rather than capital-intensive methods to achieve this goal. In the absence of high levels of automation and mechanization, the women are needed in the work force. They also have very few options in their over-all life-style; they can't stop work and go on welfare, or collect unemployment compensation for extended periods of time. Even getting a better job or moving to another community for personal reasons requires official permission and red tape.

While child care is provided (not everywhere, but more readily in the cities; not free, but affordable) the Communist state exacts trade-offs in loss of family privacy. The child is plugged into the local public health immunization program. In China the mother is pressured into use of a family planning technique and is called to account in case of contraceptive failure. Parent participation in day care center policy-making is a totally unknown concept. The children are indoctrinated with the official political and social ideologies from infancy on.

These systems do offer inexpensive and efficient child care to a significant proportion of the population, but at a price that is totally unacceptable in a democratic society: state control of the curriculum, interference in the private life of the family, and freezing people into rigid routines deemed socially desirable that allow no alternative options at all.

As with all social programs, the Scandinavian countries are help us as wonderful models to follow. However, all reports indicate severe shortages of day care slots, despite government efforts to increase their availability. In all the industrial nations of Western Europe, private facilities spring up to supplement and even overtake those under government sponsorship. The concerns expressed about low-paid staff

and frequent staff turnover are reminiscent of America. So are the worries about the long-term effects upon children and upon the quality of family relationships.

No matter where we look there are no nirvanas.

"No One Speaks for Children - They Have No Vote"

IT IS FASHIONABLE to state that since children have no voting rights, their interests are being ignored by the body politic. The day care leadership has therefore taken upon itself the task of representing the allegedly neglected interests of children in the public arena.

Actually, the youngsters do not seem to lack for willing spokesmen. In the course of the preparation of this report, we came across literally dozens of advocacy groups in New Jersey and in the nation. Others mushroom spontaneously at the hint of fiscal threat or control, and wither away between crises.

Particularly interesting among the advocacy groups are the "4Cs," which are encouraged by federal legislation to operate under contract with the states and which are financed under Title XX by the regular seventy-five per cent federal-twenty-five per cent local match formula. New Jersey has ten such councils in operation, each one organized on a countywide basis. They vary in size from large-scale operations staffed with technical experts, such as the Day Care Coordinating Council of Essex County, impressively housed in attractive quarters with lecture rooms and toy demonstrations areas, to one-person operations.

A very real limit to their expansion has been their own difficulty in raising the matching funds needed to secure the federal money. States and local governments have been reluctant to pour money into something as nebulous as a "coordinating" agency, preferring to put their scarce tax dollars into direct service delivery. Consequently, the 4Cs have had to rely on the United Way and on private foundations, which tends to provide an unsteady base for operations.

Their functions are vague and open to various interpretations. The Essex group has taken on a leadership role in in-service and continuing education for day care personnel; others embark upon "needs studies" that predicably show a severe shortage of day care resources. In New Jersey, they generally try to help individual community day care centers with fund-raising, proposal-writing, bookkeeping, and interpreting the latest mood in Washington and Trenton, and the numerous edicts that affect the day care providers. There is talk of organizing centers for cooperative buying of food and other supplies, but there has been no implementation. They all sponsor a great many meetings for their constituencies and attend an even greater number of them. What makes these agencies especially noteworthy is that they are peculiarly American institutions of a now passe Great Society orientation. In effect, they are a special-interest lobby financed largely by the government to criticize the government for its shortcomings and to demand greater government support for its cause.

Not content with the 4Cs' efforts at coordination and advocacy, some day care groups envision an Office of Early Childhood Development in every state capital in the nation, in the words of one proponent, "right in the Governor's Office, up

front." The Early Childhood Task Force of the Education Commission of the States has even prepared model statutes to follow or adapt in establishing some such body.¹⁵ Other groups propose more localized governmental units to push for child care interests. For example, the Emergency Committee to Save Child Care, a foundation-funded, Newark-based advocacy coalition, wants to see the establishment of an Office of Comprehensive Child Development within Newark's Department of Health and Welfare.

Thus there is impetus for the further expansion of coordinating and advocacy bodies at all levels, which could lead to the spawning of other agencies to coordinate the various coordinators. It would appear that the deep problems inherent in society's attempts to nurture increasing numbers of children whose own parents are unable or unwilling to do this task, are perceived as mere failures in coordination and advocacy.

Actually, children seem to have a surfeit of defenders, many with their own axes to grind. Besides the child care community, there are teachers and their unions, and others in the business of making money in education; the toy industry, the health care industry, the recreation business, and numerous other interests. One would also like to believe that even in these troubled times the interests of disenfranchised children are taken to heart by their enfranchised parents.

Notes—Chapter 5

- ¹The New York Times, "The Number of Jobs Keeps Declining", January 4, 1976.
- ²The New York Times, "The Cloudy Fiscal Future", February 22, 1976.
- ³The Star Ledger, "Jobs Decline at Record Pace in 8 Counties", January 4, 1976.
- ⁴The New York Times, "The Changing Face of the Labor Force", February 15, 1976.
- ⁵Andrey D. Smith, Anne E. Fortune, William J. Reid "WIN, Work and Welfare" *Social Service Review*, September 1975, p. 396.
- ⁶Transcript of Public Hearings, February 18, 1975, op. cit., p. 4A.
- ⁷The Star Ledger, "Panel will hold 2 hearings on Jersey Day Care", February, 1975.
- ⁸Entire cost born by counties.
- ⁹Based on nine per cent average state contribution to community day care programs in 1975 (Annual Report, FY 1975, Bureau of Day Care, DYFS).
- ¹⁰Based on 11.5 per cent average private contributions to community day care programs in 1975 (Annual Report, FY 1975, Bureau of Day Care, DYFS).
- ¹¹At this writing, there was no income tax in New Jersey; estimates based on five per cent sales tax on take-home income above \$3,720, the straight welfare payments.
- ¹²Total day care costs are \$5,200; private contributions of 11.5 per cent are not counted here.
- ¹³Fifty per cent federal funds, 37.5 per cent state funds, 12.5 per cent county funds.
- ¹⁴The New York Times, "Israel's Founding Mothers Look at Kibbutz Women Today", March 4, 1976.
- ¹⁵*Establishing a State Office of Early Childhood Development: Suggested Legislative Alternatives*, a report of the Education Commission of the States, 300 Lincoln Tower, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado, 80203.

Day Care and the Liberation of Women

"The availability of well-staffed and well-organized child care centers for children of all ages, for all hours of the day, and for sick as well as for healthy children would enable women to be good mothers by sharing child care responsibilities and by making mothering more of a voluntary activity. Such child care centers would free mothers to take care of their children only during the hours that they feel most inclined to do so and to enjoy the most rewarding elements of mothering rather than the drudgery of it. . . . Married women must have the option. . . to work during motherhood, including the period of early childhood, and to be creative and committed to their work. They must also be able to receive additional education, training, and experience and to explore and develop their different intellectual, social, political, recreational and creative interests, talents, and potentials."

84

Constantina Safilios-Rothchild, "Parents Need for Child Care" in *Child Care—Who*

PROFESSOR SAFILIOS-ROTHCHILD'S position seeks the ultimate in carefree motherhood. Most mothers of young children, even died-in-the-wool feminists with active careers, concede they will have to tend to a sick child at home, to put up with a lot of drudgery, and to forego for a time the further exploration and development of their social and recreational potential in the interest of a decent and meaningful role as parent.

Professor Safilios-Rothchild is on target, of course, when she speaks of the drudgery of motherhood. The obsolete canon that motherhood is a state of unmitigated bliss was sheer hypocrisy, foisted upon generations of women by a society unwilling to grant them any other role. The inescapable fact is that motherhood is often tedious, repetitive and unappreciated work.

One may well ask, however, just whom it is that society can engage to relieve mothers from this drudgery? Who is so eager to perform the odious chores rejected by the mothers who want to be "free to take care of their children only during the hours that they feel most inclined to do so . . . ?" Where are we to find people ready to inconvenience themselves *in loco parentis*, day or night, with sick and cranky youngsters, while their mothers are busy exploring and developing "their talents and potentials?"

There would be no question of public policy involved if these very busy individuals, whose heavy schedules of well-paid work and fulfilling avocations keep them from carrying out their child care responsibilities, were to buy someone else's time, dearly, to carry out the job for them. But in effect the demand here is for society to do the hiring for them, engaging people on their behalf and at public expense to take care of the drudgery, at wages that of necessity must be modest. The liberation of mothers would feature as an inevitable byproduct the creation of a caste of substitute caretakers condemned to a work-life of drudgery on behalf of other people's children.

This sort of liberation for mothers is probably unworkable, and it may be morally reprehensible as well. It denigrates motherhood to the status of a part-time hobby, an experience to be sampled and set aside at whim, one more pleasurable pursuit among many others. It is liberation for mothers at the expense of children.

Being a parent has always meant foregoing some personal pleasures and making-do with less, giving up opportunities and limiting one's options. Nothing that has happened in the past twenty years indicates that the offspring of *homo sapiens* have magically acquired the capacity for independent survival that would make parental sacrifice obsolete.

The young mother with career aspirations who stays home to care for a baby or a pre-school child is definitely at a professional disadvantage. Colleagues without children are likely to advance in their careers while she remains professionally inactive. She may in fact never quite succeed in catching up with less-encumbered competitors, and the interruption in her work-life may have some lasting unfavorable repercussions. Furthermore, the loss of her earnings means a smaller income for a family that now includes an extra person; her life-style will be predictably more restrained than that of working colleagues.

She will miss out not only on professional advancement, but on a whole network of social interactions and stimulation that is work-related, while her own social life will be uncomfortably restricted and tend toward the monotonous. Today's young mother is especially vulnerable to social isolation and loneliness because she is not likely to live in the community in which she grew up. She often finds herself a transient without relatives or close friends. Her close high school and college associates will have scattered in all directions and her family of origin is not at hand for practical advice or baby-sitting. As things stand now, even if grandma is geographically closeby, she may be a youthful and busy career woman in her own right, or a newly enrolled college student, at last enjoying her own relief from child care obligations.

Despite these many very real disadvantages, motherhood is still held to be a desirable state by many. On balance, they find that the joys outweigh the sacrifices. In their view, children are our connection with the future and a necessity for completing life. There is no scale for weighing such considerations against drudgery or inconvenience or career. On the other hand, medicine and the law have given the women the right to choose or reject motherhood, and changing attitudes have removed the stigma from a decision to reject.

In a sense, everything that has been said or written about women, their work, their families, their role in life, before January 22, 1973 is now obsolete and in need of reexamination. On that day, the Supreme Court of the United States declared abortion to be a private concern between a woman and her physician, not subject to state prohibition. The decision awarded the women of this nation nearly total control of their reproductive histories.

The implementation of this judicial landmark has been accomplished at a heavy national cost -- the deep psychological pain and suffering of many who find abortion abhorrent and are genuinely repulsed by its legalization. Nevertheless, public opinion polls have repeatedly shown that the majority of Americans, including people who would not themselves use abortion because of moral reservations, favor allowing others the right to choose and to gain further control over their lives.

It can now truly be said that motherhood is a voluntary status. (Interestingly, men now have less choice in the matter of becoming a parent, since a recent Supreme Court ruling clarified that women do not need their husbands' consent to obtain an abortion.) Pregnancy termination is not only legal, it has also been perfected into a medical procedure that is quick, inexpensive (usually covered by insurance) and safe. Done in the early stages of gestation it involves fewer risks than pregnancy and birth.

Society, in granting this option to women, even at the sad cost of offending the psychological and moral sensitivities of many valued citizens, has a right to expect in turn a moral imperative on the part of women to accept the consequences of their decisions. The choice of becoming a mother, now arrived at freely, entails the obligation to carry out concomitant responsibilities which cannot be pawned off upon society. As it must, parenthood means a loss of individual freedom and comfort, but a loss that now has been freely chosen. From this perspective, a corollary argument can be made that if the right to abortion were ever again abridged, and women were forced to bear children in situations intolerable to them, such a coercive society

would then be saddled with the obligation to provide subsidized services, including child care, that would restore to women some of the freedom they might have enjoyed if they had retained the option of declining the motherhood role.

The women of America have taken advantage of the advances in contraceptive technology, including safe and quick male and female sterilizations, and abortions. This is seen in the steep decline of our national birth rate, from twenty-five births for every thousand people in the population in 1957, to about fifteen births per thousand population in 1973. In some areas, the decline has been even more pronounced – in New Jersey, the rate was down to 12.7 births per thousand population in 1973.¹

TABLE VI
Number of births recorded in the state of New Jersey, and
in the cities of Newark and Trenton*

Number of births	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
State of New Jersey	120,168	111,376	99,050	94,024	94,242	91,457
Newark	9,499	8,888	7,800	7,364	6,976	6,512
Trenton	2,169	2,168	1,970	1,848	1,719	1,703

* Source: State of New Jersey, Dept. of Health, Office of Public Health Statistics

These reductions in the birth rate have been achieved even while a sizable proportion of the fertile female population has no access to family planning services. According to estimates by the Planned Parenthood Federation of America² about 230,000 New Jersey women with low or marginal incomes are in need of such services, but 100,100 of these – forty-four per cent of the total – have been unable to avail themselves of family planning help either in the private or in the public medical service-delivery system. The same holds for about sixty-eight per cent of the sexually active adolescents in the state, who continue to contribute a disproportionate number of births to the total.

It is logical to assume that reaching these women and providing them with the contraceptive services they need would further reduce the number of accidental conceptions, and would bring to these women the possibility of greater freedom and self-determination. Since these are mostly women whose incomes are at or near the poverty line, and adolescents who are often still in high school, they are prime candidates for subsidized day care services. Any reduction in the number of accidental births to women in these groups would result in a decline in demand for subsidized child care.

This reasoning has been recognized by social planners. The usual Title XX funding formula – seventy-five per cent federal money matched by twenty-five per cent in locally raised funds – has been modified in the case of family planning to a ninety-per cent federal-ten per cent local match requirement. State planners have responded to this inducement. The New Jersey Comprehensive Social Services Plan classifies family planning as a service category that meets all of the five national goals addressed by the Title XX legislation and described in our section on Title XX. The plan for the 1976 fiscal year allocates \$4.1 million to family planning, a sum that will generate \$4.5 million with the addition of the ten per cent local match. The same allocation has been maintained for the 1977 fiscal year.

The New Jersey study by the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, based on 1974 data, indicated a need for further public expenditures of \$6.6 million, in addition to the \$7.2 million already being spent in the state, to reach and serve the large groups in New Jersey's population that hitherto lacked access to family planning. The new Title XX allocation goes a long way toward meeting that goal. If these funds are spent wisely, on outreach into schools, colleges, and in the state's medically underserved rural areas, and on the actual provision of services through non-traditional delivery systems such as clinics-on-wheels, there is hope that the personal and societal benefits of parenthood by choice will be expanded and will help balance human needs and resources.

The American family has been shrinking. In 1950, the average household had 3.52 people living in it; by 1974, this was down to 2.97 people.³ This decrease reflects not only fewer children per family, but also the absence of fathers and grandparents. It has been suggested, only half in jest, that the American family of the future will consist of a mother, a child and a dog (a comment upon our exploding canine population). A more cynical variant of this school of social prognosticators envisions the coming American family as made up of a mother, a child – and a social worker. Certainly, women in all strata of society now express a desire for small families of one or two children, and organizations of non-parents are springing up to extoll the virtues of childless unions.

In a society in which jobs are scarce and will remain so for years to come, there is no need to encourage people to have more children and there are sound reasons for discouraging them from having many children even when they do want them. In a world threatened with global starvation, America, no less than Bangladesh, can be considered overpopulated – not in terms of insufficient food or land, but in its inability to provide useful work for all its citizens, and in its gluttonous per capita consumption of the world's finite resources. Thus, the aspirations of women for liberation from the burdens of child care conform with our national need for population stabilization. The woman who prefers to forego motherhood in favor of greater self-fulfillment makes a responsible decision entitled to respect.

Most women, however, will opt for small families of one or two children, planned for periods in their life-cycle when they feel ready to cope with the challenges of parenthood, and when career disruptions are likely to be least damaging. Many changes already in effect have helped to minimize professional losses, and others can be instituted that will further enhance the opportunities for successfully combining

motherhood and career.

College education is no longer limited to recently graduated high school students. Increasingly, it has opened up and indeed courted older people, with course offerings given on and off campus, through correspondence, television programs, and independent studies, at times that range from early morning to late evening, with weekend seminars and summer conferences. It has become common for mothers and grandmothers to start college, or to continue studies undertaken many years earlier, and then go on to obtain degrees and entry into the job market. Unfortunately, the effectiveness of this approach has been severely limited of late by the general shortage of jobs, which has been especially hard on mature women competing with younger candidates.

Other educational innovations have made it easier for a trained person to re-enter the job market after prolonged absence, through courses that renew dormant skills. Even steadily employed and active professionals are now expected to continue their studies and the concept that professional education is a never-quite-completed process has been widely accepted. Enrolling in continuing education courses gives temporarily inactive parents an opportunity to keep abreast of developments in their fields and eases the pain of professional re-entry in later years.

(Throughout this report we have repeatedly discussed the child-rearing role of mothers and used the feminine third-person pronoun. This has been strictly a matter of grammatical convenience. Fathers are assuming more active roles in child-rearing, with excellent results. There appears to be no reason why fathers can't take on major nurturing responsibilities, at least in some cases. In others, it might be advisable to alternate the work and staying-at-home roles between both parents, so as to minimize the occupational losses to either parent. We can do no better than to quote Professor Bronfenbrenner on this point: "I don't care whether it's the father who works and the mother who stays at home. Or the mother who works and the father who stays at home. Or both working part time. But please, God, let there be somebody."⁴)

Testimony before legislative committees and other day care financing sources tends to be full of heartwarming stories in which subsidized day care is the catalyst that permits mothers of young children to complete college studies and to go on to rewarding jobs, often as day care professionals. Sometimes the examples cited vary a bit, and it is the father who is able to go to school while the mother is freed to go to work and support the family.

All this may be true enough, but in fact nothing much happened in these cases that could not have happened anyway, though perhaps in a changed time sequence. College can be undertaken by either or both parents, part-time, or even delayed -- especially when no assurance of a remunerative job awaits the graduate. And certainly parenthood can be postponed by those committed to professional studies or advancement, to be embraced later at a more appropriate time in one's life. The need for slower population growth, a chronic lack of jobs and the diminished value of college credentials make it unnecessary to manically pursue work, and studies, and parenthood all at once. Certainly the public weal is not sufficiently involved for it to provide subsidized day care in order to make such a frenzied pursuit of edu-

cation, career and parenthood possible. Women especially, with their longer life expectancy, have the time as well as the social justification to enjoy these stages sequentially.

The women's liberation movement has been amazingly successful in the decade since it first penetrated the consciousness of America. It has given inspiration and courage to hundreds of thousands of women who heretofore had not dared to assert their full rights as human beings and had feared to use their true abilities. The movement won for women the right of control over their reproductive histories, without which all their other rights are meaningless. It may well find its place in history alongside the Renaissance and the Enlightenment as a great spiritual and intellectual liberating force in Western Civilization.

And yet not all its works have served women well, and the children even less so. By holding up the independent working woman as the new ideal, it has, perhaps inadvertently, demeaned women in traditional roles. It has artificially created an urgent need in women, psychological even more than financial, to look for fulfillment in the market place. In fostering this attitude, the movement has shown little compassion for the needs of young children. Generally, its vehement assertions that comprehensive child care services ought to be an important national priority carry little conviction, since child care is apparently not sufficiently important for liberated mothers to bother with themselves.

In addition, the feminists have been grossly inconsiderate of the many women who simply cannot be liberated on the movement's terms - the mothers of severely handicapped children, for example. No amount of declamation and rhetoric can really "liberate" the morally sensitive mother of a disabled child and enable her to participate fully in the pleasures of self-realization through glamorous jobs and financial independence. Such a mother may well never be free of her child's dependency and of her own decent instincts that tie her down. Her chances to develop her own potentials are bound to be limited. From the Sisters, she can expect neither sympathy nor help.

Among the large number of public institutions and policies affected by the movement is child day care. The effect on day care policy is not the simple freeing of the mother for self-fulfillment. The greater freedom won by women means greater individual responsibility in some cases and a decreased responsibility for society. In terms of day care policy, the women's movement has reduced the need and the justification for subsidized day care for many families.

Notes - Chapter 6

¹"Facts of Life in New Jersey," Family Planning Public Affairs Office, Trenton, New Jersey, November 26, 1975.

²*Family Planning Services: New Jersey, Focus for State Initiative* - The Research and Development Division of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., Published by the Alan Guttmacher Institute.

³*Statistical Abstract of the United States - 1975*, U.S. Census Bureau, p. 39.

⁴Interview in U.S. News and World Report, June 7, 1976, p. 49.

Day Care in New Jersey

WE HAVE THUS far dealt with day care largely in terms of policy, without regard to a particular time or place. We turn now to day care policy in one place - New Jersey - and its administration by one agency - The Division of Youth and Family Services (DYFS) in the Department of Human Services (formerly the Department of Institutions and Agencies). As we shall see, New Jersey is not atypical. It has some of its own peculiar problems, but in the main its daily difficulties and successes represent the abstract questions of policy brought down to the level of administrative practice.

In the course of gathering information for this report, we enjoyed the cooperation of administrators and planners in the DYFS, with whom we had repeated contacts. We sought and received information from other day care interests, including advocates in the legislature, the 4Cs councils, and representatives of professional early childhood education and the private day care delivery system.

We visited thirty-two day care centers in twenty-one communities scattered over thirteen counties. We talked at some length to center directors to understand the difficulties that beset them in their day-to-day operations and the many program variations that characterize individual centers.

ORGANIZED DAY CARE in New Jersey can be traced back continuously for about ninety years. The Autumn 1975 issue of *Young World*, the publication of the New Jersey Association for the Education of Young Children, lists seven day nurseries still in operation that were founded between 1887 and 1894. Other such facilities probably flourished at that time, and perhaps earlier, but succumbed during one of the periods of public disinterest in their services. These day nurseries were of the classic philanthropic mold, with well-to-do board members setting policies and raising the money needed to make day care available inexpensively to deserving poor working mothers.

In 1962, when federal legislation first allowed for payment of child care costs on behalf of welfare recipients seeking employment, very few organized day care slots were available in the state. Mothers wishing to take advantage of the new law often made their own informal arrangements with neighbors and friends, who were then paid with welfare funds. This trend accelerated and soon required some social work personnel to help job-seeking women to find child care resources.

Late in 1968, the Work Incentive (WIN) program went into effect. Masses of New Jersey welfare recipients were screened and selected for job training projects. The federal government, finding the program slowed for lack of child care facilities, made large sums available to the state for the rapid development of day care services. The Bureau of Children's Services, in the Department of Institutions and Agencies, the state's child welfare arm, had in the past limited its role to adoption supervision and to foster home placements. Suddenly it found itself thrust into an administrative and leadership void in day care, which occupied more and more of its time and budget. In 1969, responding to federal and community pressures for immediate services, the State of New Jersey went into the day care business, opening and operating a center under its own auspices. In the next few years, it acquired twenty-one more such facilities. Of its present complement of twenty-two state-operated and sponsored centers, thirteen have been reserved for the children of WIN trainees (despite these expansions, however, most offspring of WIN enrollees continue to be cared for in neighborhood homes).

Community day care, sponsored by grass-roots community-action boards, also took off with great speed during the late 1960's. The state's newly established Department of Community Affairs had among its many duties the job of acting as a conduit and coordinating mechanism for the anti-poverty money flowing from Washington in the wake of urban disorders in 1967. The department was under pressure to start new programs with high visibility in the community; the Day Care 100 program was one which got off to a flying start. Apparently, the idea was to establish 100 model day care centers around the state, to demonstrate the effectiveness of community-controlled developmental child care in combatting the social ills that had produced traumatic civil strife.

One person is closely associated with devising and starting the program - Ms. Paddy Warlock, now a consultant in the Massachusetts Department of Mental Health, then a fiery community day care enthusiast in the N.J. Department of Community Affairs. Through her energetic proddings, the first Day Care 100 center was launched in 1968. There were some misgivings among the department's top

brass about starting the program with only a rudimentary administrative structure; federal guidelines were so vague as to be almost useless.

The goal of 100 "Day Care 100" centers was never reached. There are now twenty-two such centers (These centers should not be confused with the centers operated directly by the state. The fact that there are twenty-two of each is a coincidence) launched by grass-roots community action groups under the administrative aegis of the DCA, and financed by a twenty-five per cent contribution of state money to qualify for federal funds.

Impetus for the program's expansion was lost when Governor Cahill ordered a study of day care administration in the state, which resulted, in 1973, in a consolidation of all the state's activities in this area into a single Bureau of Day Care, attached to a newly formed Division of Youth and Family Services. The bureau was charged with the continued operation of the state-run centers, the over-all administration of the twenty-two Day Care 100 centers, and the development of more day care resources through contracts with community organizations.

With New Jersey entering a protracted period of inflation and stagnating state revenues, the state looked for ways to avoid further large-scale commitments to day care operations. It sought to forego any blanket obligation to provide the local match money needed to qualify for federal funds (as had been the case in the Day Care 100 program) and to pass this responsibility on to the day care providers themselves. This had the effect of bringing some of the traditional social service groups into the state's day care program - the YM-YWCAs, the Salvation Army, established day care nurseries operating in poverty areas, churches, associations for the handicapped. It worked against sponsorship of new centers by *ad-hoc* community action boards, since the better-known sponsors had a fund-raising capacity that the spontaneous grass-roots organizations could not compete with.

Since the formation of DYFS, its day care activities have expanded rapidly and absorbed a major portion of the Division's energies and budget. In the 1972 fiscal year, the year before the Division became operative, day care financed with Title IVA or WIN funds accommodated 12,364 children in the state, with expenditures reaching a total of \$8.9 million.¹ In November 1975, 34,000 New Jersey children were in day care places subsidized under Title XX or WIN.² Estimated expenditures for day care in the 1976 fiscal year exceeded \$43 million.³

One reason for these staggering service increases has been the state's eagerness, under the constant prodding of day care advocates, to "capture" every available federal dollar to which New Jersey is entitled. Under Titles IVA and VI (now Title XX) the state's allocation for social services has been around \$87 million a year. But the state lacked a service delivery system extensive enough to claim these funds. In 1974 New Jersey could claim only \$43.4 million under Titles IVA and VI, and \$65 million in 1975. By 1976, however, the state reached the ceiling of available (Title XX, as of October 1, 1976) federal funds, expecting to spend the full \$87.75 million to which it was entitled.⁴

The apparent desirability of using every available federal dollar as quickly as possible favored the development of day care centers. The day care interests were well-organized and vocal, capable of moving swiftly toward implementation of their

plans. The need for such services seemed demonstrable; every facility that opened quickly filled up and produced new waiting lists (almost as if the very availability of day care created a new demand for more - a theory that enjoys some currency). Private donors could be rallied for a cause that promised to keep mothers off welfare and at the same time maintain their children in an enriched learning environment that would practically guarantee their future success in school and in later life.

As a result, day care services for children became the fastest growing social service area. Appropriations for day care make up the largest single program component in the budget of the DYFS. Because budgets are largely determined by previous budgets, by the time Title XX went into effect day care for children had claimed thirty-two per cent of the state's total allocation for social services. This is still a far cry from the New York City experience, in which day care consumed over seventy per cent of all the Title XX monies.

The disproportionate input of tax dollars into "developmental day care for children" has come in for some questioning lately. For one thing, community-based day care centers have increasingly been advocated as an alternative to institutionalization for the elderly, the mentally ill, and other potentially dependent populations. Their development, however, has not received much encouragement in the state's Social Service Plan; only three per cent of the total Title XX allocation is given over to such projects in the 1976 plan.

It is interesting to note that within the mammoth Department of Institutions and Agencies, a subtle but significant split was detectable. DYFS consistently took an advocacy stance toward day care, officially committing itself to more and better day care services for children. On the other hand, the Department's Social Services Planning Unit, charged with the yearly preparation of a comprehensive plan for the use of the Title XX funds, appeared to have misgivings about allowing child day care to dominate the social service picture in New Jersey. The over-sixty-five group is now the fastest growing sector in the population. Nationally, this group's percentage in the total population has increased from 8.1 to 10.3 between 1950 and 1974, while the under-five sector has decreased from 10.8 to 7.7 during that same period.⁵ In New Jersey, statewide public health statistics show that deaths declined these last few years, from 68,865 in 1972 to 65,391 in 1975; births also dropped sharply in that four-year span, from 99,050 to 91,457.⁶ Clearly, a growing older population will require a larger slice of the tax dollar designated for social services. The *Comprehensive Social Services Plan for FY '76* states that it "recognized that there was a far heavier concentration on services to families and children than on services to the aged and disabled. . ." and also that the FY '76 Plan represents "a definite shift in priorities toward . . . services to the aged and disabled." Commissioner Ann Klein, who headed the Department of Institutions and Agencies (and now the Department of Human Services) is aware of the conflict, and bemoans the finite limits of available tax dollars which create a situation in which "day care is competing with meals-on-wheels."

The phenomenal growth of subsidized day care for children in New Jersey during the past three to four years took place at a time of considerably reduced public interest in social action endeavors and of tightened federal budgets for community

action and anti-poverty measures. The public, in fact, seemed generally quite unaware that free, tax-supported day care was available in the state. In an informal poll of forty well-informed New Jersey residents, conducted by the Center staff in early 1976, only thirty per cent of the respondents knew of this service. Another thirty per cent were sure that there was no such thing, and forty per cent had no knowledge about the subject one way or another.

The public's overall lack of information regarding the state's day care system can hardly be blamed on a lack of news coverage about it. Beginning in the fall of 1975, and continuing through the spring of 1976, DYFS repeatedly made headlines in the New Jersey and even in the New York press.

The first of a series of press disclosures hit the stands in November 1975. It stated that DYFS, under the direction of James L. Kagen "during the past year has become a haven for people from debt-ridden New York City who have been hired for top-management jobs by skirting the Civil Service rules and examinations."⁷ The accusation hit a raw nerve, as New Jersey employees in state and local governments faced cutbacks in their own jobs, due to deteriorating economic conditions and stagnating state revenues. Furthermore, the association of these administrators with nearly bankrupt New York City seemed suspect to many people, as though these New Yorkers would soon do for New Jersey what they had presumably done for New York!

Several investigations were started in the wake of the outcry that greeted these disclosures. A few weeks later, the State Civil Service Commission's investigation into hiring practices cleared DYFS of any serious violations of Civil Service regulations, chiding them only for delays in converting some temporary consultant and project specialist jobs into regular staff positions.

Despite the xenophobic nature of the charges, they opened the flood gates to others. Long-simmering resentments within DYFS flew into the open. District office social workers, groaning under heavy caseloads brought about by a new child abuse reporting law and changes in juvenile justice administration, complained of being ignored by the Central Office. In their view, much-needed social workers were not being added to the field staff while the administrative staff in Trenton was expanding rapidly. The workers charged that the new contracts prepared by the New York experts were impeding contract negotiations with day care providers. Urgently needed forms to legalize the removal of endangered children from their homes were not available for use by caseworkers, their release held up in Trenton.

Most germane to our concerns was the well-publicized release of an audit by the Office of Fiscal Affairs (the fiscal arm of the New Jersey State Legislature) dated January 20, 1976, of DYFS' operations. In the area of day care, the Division's records on twenty-six centers were reviewed, and field audits of seven centers were conducted.

The findings indicated very casual record-keeping, with basic information regarding eligibility and attendance often missing from the files. Expenditure reports submitted to and accepted by the Division were confusing and followed no standard reporting procedure.

Among other findings from the more extensive field audits:

- - - Based on actual attendance, six of the seven centers received substantial overpayments.

- - - Operating costs per child, based on actual attendance and program expenditures, ranged from \$1,800 to \$5,100 (maximum allowable reimbursement for full-time pre-school care is \$2,600 per year; it can go up to \$3,000 if transportation is provided).

- - - The auditors noted unauthorized expenditures running well above the approved budgets; they cited an example of \$48,000 in excess expenditures for renovations being recouped through operating funds.

- - - A highly publicized revelation concerned a center that had leased a boat for \$49,700, as part of its program, and lost about \$36,000 when the leasing company went bankrupt after delivering only about a third of the pre-paid services. The questions here, of course, must go well beyond the solvency of the firms the centers do business with, to the more fundamental ones of what constitutes a sound programming in tax-supported day care.

- - - Another item that received attention was a salary collected by a center employee; it exceeded by \$60,970 the amount budgeted for it.

The Office of Fiscal Affairs concluded that "the day care program was not adequately monitored during the period of audit and serious internal control weaknesses existed. In general we found that the enforcement of contract provisions was lax. . . there did not appear to be sufficient staff to adequately administer this rapidly expanding program."⁸

The Office went on to make several recommendations, including a formal audit of all the 240 centers under contract, periodic field visits, some revisions in the contract document, "administrative counseling prior to funding," and audit of all periodic reports.

The OFA also looked at the WIN day care program, designed to accommodate the children of welfare recipients enrolled in federally sponsored job training. Funding for these spaces is especially attractive to the state, with ninety per cent of the money coming from Washington, and the remaining ten per cent shared with the counties. However, a child's period of eligibility is limited to the time of the mother's actual training plus ninety days beyond that. Once the mother is regularly employed (or very likely, unemployed but no longer in training) other arrangements must be made, usually through use of Title XX day care facilities.

The report found heavy overspending in the WIN day care program. This was due to a sudden cutback in federal support for WIN day care and stricter enforcement of eligibility rules. Understandably, DYFS had not been in any hurry to remove a youngster from an environment to which he had adjusted and for which such favorable financial terms were available. The tendency was to stretch out the ninety day post-training period, especially since alternate facilities were hard to come by. Thus, the 3,300 ineligible WIN children were maintained in 1975 in the WIN account, which became overdrawn by \$4.2 million. Eventually, seventy-five per cent of these funds were recovered by claiming the expenditure under Title XX, with the state forced to pick up the other million through various feats of budget juggling.

Incredibly, the OFA report tells us that "Monthly bank reconciliations were not

prepared during the period 10/73 to 10/74. Expenditures during this period amounted to approximately \$4.4 million. The account was unreconciled at May 31, 1975."⁹ Few householders would get away with such nonchalant book-keeping methods.

Ms. Klein had anticipated the OFA's criticisms in her December news release, which dealt primarily with DYFS hiring practices. Pointing out that the contract community day care program had grown to its present proportions in just five years, with insufficient increases in its fiscal control departments, she allowed that "the Division today continues to face longstanding, serious administrative deficiencies, including . . . absence of thorough expenditure review and program analysis for . . . affiliated contract agencies . . . absence of fiscal audits covering \$72 million in expenditures for day care . . . absence of fiscal and related technical assistance to the Division's 250 affiliated day care agencies."¹⁰ Again, "with very few exceptions, the Division has never audited its five-year contract day care program under which over \$50 million has been spent . . ."¹¹ Contracts in use by the Division prior to 1974 were wholly inadequate."¹²

Commissioner Klein reiterated many times that these deficiencies go back to a time before the present DYFS administration, and that in fact action had been initiated under her tenure at the Department of Institutions and Agencies and Kagen's at DYFS to remedy this sorry state of affairs. New performance-based contracts were being instituted, requiring greater accountability from the community agencies. A request had already been made to the state for funding an independent external audit of all day care purveyors, and a permanent internal audit unit for DYFS had just been vastly expanded, with new ability for monitoring external and internal operations and for assisting contract providers in meeting their obligations. After the release of the OFA report, Ms. Klein emphasized that it was the Division itself that had alerted the OFA to some of the centers with suspect practices, and that much had already been done to improve and standardize record-keeping.

Though she did not do so, Ms. Klein might also have diluted the blame a bit and universalized New Jersey's unfortunate experience by pointing an accusing finger at a state like Vermont, which had been funded to set up and run a model day care system. An evaluation of that statewide project focuses on problems that have a familiar ring:

"Data kept by the day care operators also reflected a lack of uniformity in record-keeping and reporting. Expenditure and income records were seen as 'most useful' to the operators, but were not centrally collected or used for area-wide or state-wide decisions, and not all the required records were useful . . . there was no evidence of systematic decisionmaking which sought and considered information from the field . . . problems could be traced to the absence of reliable, timely, useful information about every subject."¹³

Carrying out the harsh mandate to make contract agencies fully accountable for the public money they spend is a task that has bedeviled jurisdictions with such widely divergent fiscal reputations as New York City and Vermont. Given a history

of complex and untested programs launched at break-neck speed with only casual controls, a determination to "capture" every potential federal dollar as quickly as possible, through the uncritical acceptance of any program mechanism that could be readied for that purpose, it is not surprising to find New Jersey on that list.

In an interview with a Center staff member, Kagen expressed doubts about the actual seriousness of the charges raised by the press and the OFA. He believed that the "ripoffs" were small compared with the benefits the agencies provide and that when analyzed more carefully most of them would reduce themselves to simple rule infractions rather than intentional frauds. Kagen's optimism on that score has been reiterated in public statements. The *Trenton Times* of May 17, 1976 quotes him as challenging the rumors circulating in the capital that the independent auditors will be unable to trace between two and twenty million dollars. "They (Treasury officials) can't know . . . The figure could be zero, it could be a dollar seventy-five . . ." When asked whether in the future he would be inclined to concentrate on stricter fiscal controls before starting new services, Kagen stated forcefully that this would not be the case, "my job is to get services out there, and not to sit on all these dollars."¹⁴

Another day care crisis made headlines in the spring of 1976. Some of the available day care money had been allocated to the DYFS district offices so that social workers in the field could use it to purchase day care - from profit-making or non-profit providers, from neighborhood families or centers - as part of the casework management of seriously disturbed and disorganized families under their supervision. There are situations in which day care might spell the difference between keeping a child with his family or removing him to a foster home or institution.

However, it now appeared that these funds were being used at unprecedented rates. Asked to cope with growing numbers of grossly troubled families, and having but few resources to call upon, social workers made abundant use of day care. Thus, the district office day care category, budgeted at \$150,000 per month, was being used at the rate of \$350,000 monthly. Along with growing overruns in the district offices' budget for homemaker services, deficits were anticipated to reach over one million dollars by the end of the fiscal year.

By January, the threat of insolvency was real enough to prompt an internal memo to the field staff outlining service cutbacks.¹⁵ In April, headlines proclaimed that the money shortage threatened to shut down operations of DYFS for the remaining months of the fiscal year;¹⁶ the million-plus deficit, it turned out, was actually about \$5 million, since these were the dollars needed for the federal match.¹⁷ The situation was dire because deficit spending by any state agency, in any account, is illegal in New Jersey. The Division was rescued at the eleventh hour when it was granted permission by the legislature to juggle its various accounts to cover the depleted ones.

The day care leadership, anxious about the independent audits being conducted on their operations, had their own complaints to air against DYFS. In the course of our talks with the directors of thirty programs receiving Division-administered Title XX funds, these problems were frequently highlighted:

--- The agencies have operated without any formal instruction manuals to guide

them. Complicated directions were channeled through field workers in the district offices, acting as liaison between the day care purveyors and the central office in Trenton. The field workers had highly individual work styles and were often unclear themselves about newly promulgated rules and their applications. Staff turnover in the state agency has been high, so that new people unfamiliar with the requirements were constantly put in the uncomfortable position of having to explain them. Day care agency administrators, relying heavily upon oral instructions, often found themselves doing the wrong thing.

At the legislative public hearings on day care in February 1975, the havoc resulting from the lack of a simple manual was brought out in the testimony. Craig Salins, director of the Union County 4Cs, described it to an incredulous legislator:

"A day care center asked me the other day if there was a simple manual they could follow on financial accounting and reporting for fiscal control. I asked the staff in the Division. They bounced me to the Treasury, who bounced me around. By the time I had made four or five phone calls, I just decided that probably no such book exists. To this date, I have not heard of it. To my knowledge, there is no manual.

The policies seem to be verbal, (i.e. oral) and that is confusing to the agencies, because if they are assigned a staff person to work with them -- and there has been quite a turnover -- the staff person tells them one thing, and they begin to prepare their budget and their proposal. They get it all written up and they send it in, and then they are notified that their State caseworker, as it were, their State staff person has been pulled off and put on another project, and a new person is coming in. The new person reads their budget and their proposal and says 'Oh, that's all wrong. You put this in, and that is not supposed to be there, and you have to change that.' Now, they have spent two months putting it together, and now they have to go back to the drawing boards again."

In the spring of 1976, well over a year after the hearings, there was still no manual to guide the provider agencies. Inquiries about this with the Bureau of Day Care brought assurance that some such guide was in preparation, and was to become available in the not-too-distant future.

--- The battle to obtain local funds needed to match federal monies has been exhausting, and seemed to become worse as more and more day care centers appealed to the same potential donors for support. Raising money for the centers occupied an inordinate proportion of the directors' time and energies, shortchanging their responsibilities for service delivery. Much expansion took place during a period of economic slowdown when the United Ways, a traditional source of help, experienced poor response to their campaigns, and had to cut back on their allocations to the agencies. Foundations, too, were hard hit by deterioration in their investment income. City and county governments were struggling and not happy about taking on further obligations, though in many cases they ultimately emerged as the reluctant rescuers.

Some day care administrators had been led to believe that the DYFS district office staffs would help them to locate and cultivate donors and they were disappointed because they received so little assistance. At the legislative hearings,

a representative of the 4Cs claimed that the councils had pretty much taken over that function because of the state's low level of activity in this area.

The difficulties in raising match money cause much discord between the administrations of the centers and the state. Charges have been heard that precious funds secured by one center have been diverted by the Bureau of Day Care to other centers, presumably those in greater difficulty still (a donor is not permitted to specify the exact agency that is to be credited with the gifts, though it can hint pointedly). The centers were also displeased because contributions from private donors had to be made in cash - the sometimes easier-to-get in-kind match did not count in the Title XX program, as it did in Head Start. Governmental donors have more latitude and are allowed to contribute cash-equivalents, such as use of buildings, staff, etc. Another sore point was that pledges of support had to be paid up in Trenton before they could be drawn against, forcing the centers to pressure the donors further. Sometimes, when the pledged match was late in reaching the central office, payments to centers for operating expenses were held up.

Most painful have been the intra-mural jealousies that have been fostered by this system. The former Day Care 100 centers still receive their needed match money from the state, for no reason other than historic precedent. They are thus spared the agonies that beset newer contract centers. The Division-run centers are also envied for their relative freedom from financial uncertainties, and the Head Start centers, which allow in-kind contributions, are seen as also more privileged.

Understandably, the organized day care interests have been lobbying for a greater share of state money to go into their program, so that the centers could be relieved, wholly or in part, from the odious task of begging for charity or local government dollars. It is equally understandable that the state has not been keen to accommodate these demands, and in fact successfully avoided putting any money into community day care until 1975, with the exception of the initial twenty-two Day Care 100 centers. (The state does provide the match for the twenty-two centers it operates under its own sponsorship and contributes half of the ten per cent needed for the nine-to-one match in the WIN program.) For fiscal 1976, a formula had evolved as follows for the allocation of state money toward the twenty-five per cent local match:

- 15% for after-school programs

- 20% for existing pre-school programs

- 30% for new or expanded day care programs

- The push continues for greater state financial involvement.

... DYFS has been using three per cent of the funds contributed by local donors for partial reimbursement of the Division's administrative expenses for the community day care program. The practice is viewed as confiscatory by the day care leaders, who have the unenviable task of generating these funds and who resent losing any portion of it to the state.

The Child Nutrition Act, a U.S. Department of Agriculture program of food support for institutions catering to children, recently changed from a commodities to a cash supplement formula. For administrative convenience, it was arranged to disburse these funds to the centers through DYFS. The day care interests suspected

this might become one more source from which the Division could siphon off three per cent despite assurances from the Bureau of Day Care that it was not even contemplated.

--- Day care directors feel uncomfortable about the rigid income eligibility rules that affect the children in their programs. As matters now stand, children whose families have incomes no higher than eighty per cent of the state's median (for 1976 this was \$12,595 for a family of four) are eligible for free services. If things go well for the family and a wage-earner gets a raise that puts them even one dollar above this line, the child is no longer eligible to remain in the program. Parents must then look for other, unsubsidized day care that is sure to set them back financially to a level below the one they were at before the wage increase. In the present New Jersey system, day care is subsidized either in its entirety or not at all. There are no gradual steps, as with sliding-scale fees.

In more relaxed times not so long ago, day care center directors felt freer to ignore upward changes in the family incomes of their charges. But with the new emphasis on up-to-date and complete record-keeping, the heat is on for prompt compliance. Those at the delivery end of day care are acutely aware of the hardships this places upon families, and especially upon young children who find themselves unceremoniously expelled from familiar environments.

It appears that a more humane response to the success of these families would be to install a sliding scale fee when an enrolled family's income goes above the eighty per cent figure. They would not be ineligible until they reached 115 per cent of the median income, the maximum allowed for Title XX services.

For similar reasons, the centers maintained by the state solely for the children of WIN trainees make very little sense. The children must leave these facilities after having adjusted to them, ninety days after the termination of their mothers' training programs. It would be far less disruptive for the child to be placed in a center with Title XX eligibles, where he could remain after WIN eligibility expires. The only transfer involved would be in bookkeeping, from the WIN to the Title XX account. Such changes would make it possible for the child to stay in the same facility for a significant portion of his most dependent years -- through the mother's training, initial employment and successive promotions.

--- Some directors of community day care centers have been most reluctant to accept children referred by Division social workers for therapeutic reasons. These youngsters come from troubled and damaging home situations. They are frequently behavior problems and more difficult to integrate into the routines of the centers. Their parents do not cooperate with teachers and social workers, and unless transportation-with-escort services are provided, absenteeism tends to be high. This is a serious worry to the center management, now operating under the terms of a stricter "performance contract" with penalties for absences above twenty per cent.

There is also a financial reason why these children are not welcome in many of the community-run centers. Directors resent having any of the local match money they so painfully raised go toward the maintenance of children who are under the supervision or protection of the state (these terms are legal differentiations indicating the degree to which the state assumes responsibility for their welfare). They feel

that these children are the state's charges and that the state should provide the needed match money for them. They tend to think of their centers not as therapeutic places for problem children but as a service to upwardly mobile lower-class families of good social adjustment - a concept that often clashes with the reality of who needs the service most.

The social workers in the field have a tough time placing their problem children. It has led to the creation of a "special needs" category for some of the most difficult children, with reimbursement rates to centers up to \$70 a week, per child. The social workers also have to rely on individually purchased day care, often at profit-making facilities. But even without encouragement from the community centers, they have been using day care for client families at unprecedented rates and vastly overexpanding their budgets in this category.

Yet it is hard to find fault with this technique of casework management. Surely if the state is to provide day care for some children its prime responsibility is to those who are known to live under conditions of physical abuse or gross neglect. To the extent that day care can protect children from a threatening environment for enough hours in the week to permit easier family interactions the rest of the time, to the extent that it can mitigate the need for foster home placements and further family breakup, the use of day care as a tool in family therapy is justified. It is an essential priority for the state and for the community as well.

--- A harrowing problem has been a pattern of late payments by DYFS to the centers, leaving them without operating funds for extended periods. Centers frequently have to borrow money to meet payrolls. They must then absorb the interest paid on the loans in their operating budgets. Markedly late payments are not rare; they are a nearly universal experience of the centers.

DYFS is not without its explanations. They range from accusations that the centers fill out their reimbursement forms inaccurately (these are prepared, we recall, without any written guidebook of instructions) to blaming the donors for taking their time in coming through with the pledged money needed for the match. Occasionally, DYFS also acknowledged inefficiencies in its reimbursement procedures.

The institution of a reliable and efficient reimbursement procedure to the service providers should be a top priority in upgrading DYFS performance. Day care workers are generally not paid enough to go for long without pay. Interest payments on loans, squeezed out of operating expenses budgeted for services for children, is a sad waste of public money intended for nobler purposes.

AS A RESULT of our inquiries into day care in New Jersey we also focus on two other policy issues that need reexamination and perhaps reformulation:

--- The period of rapid day care growth created an expansionist momentum within the social service provider agencies. That momentum was checked abruptly when New Jersey reached the ceiling of its Title XX allocation, but not before the applications for new programs had overshot the money available. By the time it became clear that the Title XX ceiling was being reached, total costs of the programs then in negotiation with DYFS were estimated at \$13 million, while only \$3.5 million was still available for Title XX day care growth in the 1976 fiscal year.

This sudden surplus of potential programs and the shortage of Title XX funds demanded a more critical look at what was being proposed than had been the rule. A system of priorities was set up by the Division and explained to its day care clientele.¹⁹ Preferences would henceforth be given to programs for (1) handicapped children, (2) bi-lingual children, (3) upgrading some existing facilities, and (4) geographic areas with critical shortages. Programs that satisfied more than one criterion were especially favored.

With Title XX now used up as a source for further growth, DYFS as well as the day care advocates wonder where to turn for more day care money. As a possible answer, the DYFS is pushing for greater use of *income disregards*, a device which takes a bit of explaining.

Welfare parents who take jobs benefit from deductions called "income disregards" which permit many of them to continue to receive supplemental welfare payments and to keep their Medicaid and food stamp entitlements. Without such incentives, a person taking a job would most likely be worse off working than staying at home on welfare. With the income disregards, it is indeed possible for a person on welfare to improve his or her standard of living by working.

Among the items allowed as income disregards are the legitimate expenses incurred as part of working, such as travel to and from work, and child care costs. The parent is reimbursed for the costs of child care in the monthly welfare check, up to a limit of \$95 per month. The money for the care comes from the same sources as the welfare payments: 50 per cent federal, 37.5 per cent state, and 12.5 per cent from the counties.

DYFS, committed to the continued expansion of day care, hopes that expanded use of this device will be acceptable to the state and to county freeholders. The latter have already been cajoled into putting some money into community day care and might not be too reluctant to give some more if they are persuaded that they can save on welfare by doing so.

Although \$95 a month for full-time care sounds like a modest figure, the lower level of federal support (fifty per cent instead of seventy-five) means that the state stands to pay \$35 of that sum, and the counties would pick up \$12. With pressures mounting for greater contribution from the state and local governments toward the more expensive Title XX program, the differential cost between the two funding formulas may eventually be small. Nevertheless, it is clear that for now expansion of day care services is going to consume a lot of state dollars, fast.

The income disregard mechanism would raise some new policy issues. The money provided under this scheme is not enough to buy center care; it may barely cover prevailing family day care fees. In practice, this system would mean that children whose families are still receiving supplemental welfare payments would be removed from Title XX centers and put into less costly family day care slots. This would free spaces at the centers for the use of children whose families are not entitled to welfare supplements but are still below the eighty-percent-of-median-income eligibility line. The program would essentially be a voucher system in which welfare eligibles are handed scrip equivalent to \$95 and told to secure child care. The

families with slightly higher incomes would have claim on "developmental center day care" a hallowed service category that would be out of reach for clients with only \$95 to spend. Even if the poorer clients wanted to pay the difference themselves and keep their children in center day care, they would be blocked by present no-fee policies; even a fee system proposed to go into effect in 1977 would not accept parental contributions large enough to close a gap beginning at \$95 a month.

Thus, using the income disregard method to create more day care spaces beyond the Title XX limit has these consequences:

1. An immediate, sharp increase in the amount of state tax dollars needed for this service.
2. The establishment of a class stratification in the allocation of day care resources, as summarized in Table VII:

TABLE VII
TYPE OF CHILD CARE ALLOCATION, BY INCOME
WITH COSTS TO USERS

INCOME LEVEL	MOST LIKELY TYPE OF DAY CARE	COST TO PARENTS
Welfare eligible	Family day care	Free up to \$95/month
Above welfare eligibility but below 80% state median	"developmental center day care"	Free, no limit
Middle class	Family day care or private center, most likely for profit	\$100/month
Upper class	In-home care, supplemented by private part-day nursery school	\$300/month

The possibility that the state will have to spend a lot of public money on a caste-ridden system of day care service may well be an indication that expansion along this line is undesirable. Future growth might better await a rational system of federal reimbursements that will not produce incentives to artificially shove some categories of eligibles into cheaper care, and/or the development of a reasonable sliding-fee system for everyone in the "free" category (up to eighty per cent of the median income in New Jersey) that would allow all eligibles to compete for the coveted center slots.

With the prospect of little growth and continued high demand for these publicly supported programs, it may well be time to question whether prized day care spaces should not be allotted on a priority basis. Among those who might be dropped from eligibility are illegal immigrants and non-resident visiting aliens.

Another group of present users who may have to go to the end of the line are college students in courses with poor employment prospects. If college students are to be subsidized with free day care service at all, the precious slots should go to

someone like the two-year community college nursing student who has a good chance of finding work after finishing this condensed curriculum, rather than to the four-year philosophy major (or even education major) at a liberal arts institution whose prospects of employment as a result of college studies are very poor. In New York, this notion has been tested in Superior Court and has been found to be legal. It is still in the appeals process but already it has focused attention on the notion of rational allocation of this scarce resource along pragmatic lines.

Until now, New Jersey planners have not recognized these distinctions in educational goals and in probable career outcomes. On the contrary, they have gone out of their way to invite the extensive use of subsidized day care for liberal arts students by taking several on-campus centers into the Title IX fold.

Licensing: The Unexpected Battle-ground

TO THE UNINITIATED, state licensing regulations of child care facilities would appear to be stodgy stuff, full of innocuous details about physical safety standards, sanitation codes, space requirements, administrative procedures, etc. But nothing touching on the subject of child care is ever neutral, and licensing has become a battleground upon which the fight between the "developmental" and "custodial" approaches is being waged.

New Jersey had something of a reputation as a "progressive" state in child care licensing. It started regulating private centers in 1946, long before many other states got around to codifying their minimum concerns for the welfare of children left in organized care. Licensing authority was placed in the Department of Education - making New Jersey the only state in the country to select this course. Other states, as they got around to promulgating licensing laws, vested the licensing function in either their public welfare or child welfare departments.

The 1946 law was aimed at private, fee-charging centers, catering to more than five children between the ages of two and five. Facilities sponsored by public bodies, such as municipalities, the state, or local school districts, or by church and fraternal groups for the use of their members, were exempted from the licensing requirements.

By the beginning of this decade, the law had become clearly inadequate. Infant care centers had come upon the scene, after-school care had taken hold, and public bodies had become heavily involved in the provision of free day care. The regulations did not apply to any of these situations. In a sense, they had hardly applied to anything at all, for the licensing unit within the Department of Education was little more than a skeleton operation functioning with a tiny staff. Enforcement was necessarily lax. License renewals were routinely carried out by mail, without field inspections. Violations were ignored and new applications ran into long delays.

Yet, though lack of enforcement made licensing practically meaningless, the professionals in early childhood education liked having the licensing function within the Department of Education. Being able to advertise that they were approved by the Department of Education bestowed a certain cachet upon private nursery schools and day nurseries. They were understandably displeased when, in 1972, the licensing authority was transferred to DYFS, then in the process of organizing as the comprehensive state agency serving the welfare of children and their families. There is little chic in publicizing that

one is "licensed by DYFS."

Even the most uncharitable critics of DYFS operations have found little to complain about with regard to enforcement under the reorganized Child Care Licensing Section. The licensing function was not placed in the Bureau of Day Care and thus remained clear of the disarray that surrounds other aspects of day care operations in the state. In a relatively short time, the section has succeeded in putting together a strong staff, with an adequate field component, that follows through on inspections and offers a measure of technical assistance to center operators in meeting license requirements. It has taken its public health responsibilities seriously and fashioned a cooperative arrangement with the State Health Department for the services of their professional sanitarians, who now include child care establishments in their regular kitchen inspections. The backlog of known unlicensed and unsafe facilities has been all but eliminated. Surprisingly, while still working under the terms of the 1946 law that exempts centers sponsored by public bodies, the section has been able to secure voluntary compliance from many such bodies, including the Head Start programs and the State of New Jersey itself, whose twenty-two state-run centers were in various stages of violation. The physical plants and the general sanitation standards of New Jersey child care facilities have been significantly improved since DYFS takeover.

In June 1973, the director of the newly formed division appointed a task force to assist in drafting a new licensing law. There was a heavy contingent of Montessori educators appointed to the initial task force, which made the group suspect to those of other pedagogic orientations. After the release of a first draft, public hearings were held in May 1974, which resulted in a second draft and another series of heated public reactions to the proposals in the spring of 1975.

The proposed new legislation broadened the licensing requirements to cover children from birth to age sixteen, in both public and private centers, in those providing free services as well as those charging fees. Only pre-school programs sponsored by local school boards and school classes (including kindergarten) that are part of a public or private educational system were exempt. It introduced a concept of differential licensing that reflected the variable needs of centers serving different child populations. These were divided into the following categories:

- Infant-Toddler: from birth to age two-and-a-half.
- Pre-School: from age two-and-a-half to age six.
- School-Age: before-and-after-school care, ages five to sixteen.
- Drop-In: to age sixteen, for brief and irregular periods of time.
- Special Needs: to age sixteen, for children with developmental disabilities.
- Night Care: to age sixteen, during normal sleeping hours.

The professionals of early childhood education, led by the New Jersey Association for the Education of Young Children, reacted with displeasure. They felt that the document's emphasis on physical safety showed insufficient concern for programs. Most of all, however, they were dismayed by proposed changes in staff qualifications, which no longer insisted on teacher certification, or even college studies, for educational supervisors. Almost as incendiary was the matter of staff-child ratios. Since the 1946 law had not been specific on the ratios, the new legislative proposal was awaited with great interest. The proposed ratios were pronounced unsatisfactory by those who had agitated

for more employees per child as a basic condition for "developmental" care.

The task force's position was that licensing is not a blueprint for optimal care but a guaranteed minimum of quality below which the service cannot be rendered safely. It had opted for a flexible approach on staff qualifications, allowing successful work experience to be substituted, wholly or in part, for academic training. On the staff-child ratios, it did not argue that the ones it proposed were necessarily the very best, but that they were safe and fair toward those centers operating without public subsidy. Centers that received public subsidies were subject to the more stringent regulations of the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, which private facilities could not hope to match without raising fees to impossible levels. Requiring larger staffs and insisting upon full-time educational supervisors with formal college credentials would cause many struggling centers to go under at a time of enormous demand for every type of day care.

Consultants who reviewed the early drafts were generally favorable. Professor Burton L. White, the distinguished Harvard educational psychologist, restated his belief that formal credentials and certification do not assure staff quality and readily accepted the substitution of supervised experience for college training. Ms. Gwen Morgan, a well-known authority on licensure, also approved of the document's flexible stand on staff education, citing "concern over avoiding the mistakes which public education has made in leaning too heavily on academic routes to the acquiring of the needed competencies."²⁰ She found the proposed ratios in keeping with those set by other states. She also suggested a system of voluntary accreditation, beyond licensing, that would serve as an incentive to upgrade further. This recommendation was incorporated by DYFS in the version that Commissioner Klein submitted to the Governor's Office on its way to legislative enactment. The most pragmatic advice came from Ms. Edna H. Hughes, of the Office of Child Development, HEW. Expressing skepticism about total faith in formal credentials, she pointed out that "you do have to fall back on the values which are held by a sufficient majority of the providers to make your standards enforceable. It is a first law of licensing that standards must be reasonable, fair, enforceable; in short, that the majority of the providers are already at the standards level to be set and that most of the others can achieve this level without jeopardy to their survival in their occupation or profession."²¹

If the licensing legislation is enacted essentially as sent through by Commissioner Klein, with staff qualifications and ratios as proposed by the task force, the state government will surely feel that it has won an important victory for reasonable child care standards.

It may, however, have committed itself to far more than it originally bargained for. The more subtle battle all along has not really been about teacher education and staff-child ratios, but the more basic issue of a guaranteed overcommitment by the state to the cause of "developmental" day care, via the seemingly innocuous flowery language of the proposed law's preamble. In this, the state may have given in without fully grasping the implications.

The introduction to the first draft was straightforward and to the point:

"The purpose of this act is to authorize the licensure and registration of child care facilities. Licenses are authorized if the act and applicable rules and regulations are met. Penalties are established if child care is provided without the required license. The purpose of licensing is to regulate the provision of child care so as to assure care, protection, supervision and the promotion of sound growth and development necessary to their health, safety and welfare."

In the second revision, a preamble appeared. Under the heading of *Public Policy*, it states:

"The legislature finds that it is in the public interest to license and to regulate facilities to assure the health, safety, development, education, and well-being of children attending child centers; that such comprehensive programs are deemed to be of value to the health, well-being and education of all children and their families; are instrumental in the awakening of talents and interests of children; provide places for preventive health measures and early detection of illnesses and handicaps; and assist the family as well as the child by supplementing the child care received within the family. The Legislature further finds that there is a great need for expansion of existing centers, and for the establishment of additional centers; that experience suggests the need for encouraging all such child centers, whether publicly or privately supported, to provide comprehensive services so that these centers might have an opportunity to afford valuable learning environments for child, parent, and community."

This verbal embroidery would commit the New Jersey Legislature, at least rhetorically, to the idea that center child care should be greatly expanded. In short, though it may have escaped the full attention of the Department of Institutions and Agencies and others (or perhaps, considering the scant attention paid to enforcement of the 1946 law, it was not deemed worth getting into a fight over it) passage of the act would be tantamount to endorsing New Jersey's own mini-version of an unfunded Mondale-Brademas bill.

The Day Care Center Survey: Some Findings

THE INFORMATION GATHERING process for this report included visits to thirty-two day care facilities located throughout New Jersey. Of the thirty-four centers we contacted for permission to visit and a chance to talk to the director, only two turned us down. Most directors were cooperative, a few were even confiding, but some were clearly uncomfortable and constrained in sharing information. The prevailing atmosphere in the day care community at the time was one of apprehension, occasioned by the flow of unflattering newspaper articles about their fiscal agent, the DYFS, and the recent appointment of independent auditors to review their records. Some directors suspected that we were disguised agents for the state, upon whom they are dependent. Conversely, others feared that we were trying to inveigle them into some covert mission against the state. Their attitude in our discussions therefore tended to be guarded, and the information we gathered must be looked at in that light.

Of the thirty-two centers that make up our sample, thirty were operating with Title XX funds. Of these, three were Division-operated facilities; two had started out in the sixties as Day Care 100 centers; two were bi-lingual centers for Hispanic client groups; two were specialized programs for children with specific handicaps.

In addition to the thirty Title XX centers, we visited a private non-profit facility that has a contract for a large contingent of Head Start children and an experimental center that mixes severely handicapped and normal children in a part-day program financed under provisions of Titles 1 and 6 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. (See Appendix for list of centers visited.)

A questionnaire was used in our discussion with center directors and other informants, not as a formal survey instrument but rather as a means to give some structure to the interviews, which usually ranged well beyond the confines of the questionnaire. Interestingly, after we had been to several centers and become fairly knowledgeable, we often found ourselves at the receiving end of many questions about other programs. Numerous meetings are called by DYFS, the 4's, and other professional and lobbying groups, but there appears to be a strong wish to check the information thus transmitted with an outside source.

The tabulations below are based on the visits and the interviews. Again, caution must be exercised to avoid too literal an acceptance of some of the findings:

A. Reimbursement Rates

Reimbursement rates ranged from a low of \$37.50 to a high of \$70 a week for children in a "special needs" category.

In the nineteen pre-school programs to which this question is applicable and from which we were able to obtain this information, the distribution was as follows:

Under \$40	1 center
\$40 to \$44.99	6 centers
\$45 to \$49.99	3 centers
\$50	7 centers
\$54	1 center (part-day special needs)
\$70	1 center (special needs)

In the three infant centers, rates were between \$65 and \$69; in the two after-school programs, the rates were \$22.50 and \$25.

Two directors of pre-school centers were operating their programs without any idea at all of what their reimbursement rates were -- surely an astonishing feat of fiscal management!

B. Date of Founding

The explosive growth of day care centers in recent years is reflected in our sample:

1890	1 center
1913	1 center
1929	1 center
1950's	2 centers
1966-1969	10 centers
1970-1974	15 centers
date not available	2 centers

C. Attendance

Children in attendance on the day of the visit were counted, and the computations that follow were derived as percentages of the official center enrollment. It should be noted that the visits took place during the winter months, sometimes on days of inclement weather, when absenteeism tends to be higher:

Attendance	Number of Centers
Above 90%	5 centers
80% to 89%	5 centers
70% to 79%	10 centers
60% to 69%	4 centers
50% to 59%	1 center
below 49%	3 centers
information not available	4 centers

When directors were asked to estimate attendance for the day, they consistently tended to overestimate the actual number of children at the center.

D. Waiting Lists

Only six of the centers in our survey had openings for more children. Most reported long waiting lists, in some cases exceeding the center's total capacity. However, several directors stated that when they contacted families on the waiting lists, as vacancies occurred throughout the year, many families had made alternative arrangements for child care or found that circumstances had changed so that day care services were no longer needed. It is impossible to estimate the size of the *bona fide* candidates for services awaiting entry to a specific center at any given time.

E. Teacher-Child Ratios

Maintaining a staff-child ratio that permits the adult in charge to interact with the children on an individual basis is very important in the provision of child care. Ratios have been a center of stormy controversy in the revision of the Federal InterAgency Day Care Requirements (FIDCR) and in the proposed new licensing law in New Jersey. It is generally assumed by the public and many experts that the fewer children per teacher, the better the quality of the care. Some professionals have questioned this, pointing out that too few children per staff person can result in overstimulation of the child, since unlike the mother in the home, the caretaker has no other duties to perform in the course of the day. The optimum teacher-child ratios have not been determined, but it is surely better to err on the side of slight overstaffing than to risk neglect.

The revised FIDCR, now theoretically in force since the President's veto in April 1976 of additional day care appropriations, mandates the following ratios:

Age of Children	Number of Children per Adult
Under 6 weeks old	1 child
6 weeks to four years	4 children
4 years to 6 years	7 children

If we can assume that the pre-school programs enroll about equal numbers of children above and below four years old, the combined ratio under the present FIDCR specifications would be one adult for 5.5 children.

The proposed New Jersey licensing law requires these ratios:

Age of Children	Number of children per adult
Under age 2 1/2	5 children
2 1/2 to 3	8 children
3 to 5	12 children
5 to 16	25 children

In our sample of pre-school programs, the range of ratios went from a low of 1 to 2.3 to a high of 1 to 10. In detail:

Number of children per adult	Pre-school centers
Under 3	1 center
3.1 to 4	3 centers
4.1 to 5	7 centers
5.1 to 5.5	3 centers
Subtotal: centers in FIDCR compliance	14 centers
5.6 to 6	2 centers
6.1 to 7	3 centers
above 7	6 centers

All the centers in our sample now easily meet the proposed state regulations, but eleven centers may fail to comply with the federal standards. These new rules are officially on the books but their future is much in doubt and the final version of the federal revisions may be closer to the state requirements.

In interpreting our tabulations, it must be remembered that:

- - - not all children are present every day, so that in practice fewer children are under the charge of staff members.

- - - employees work in shifts to cover the long hours of center operation. This results in more children per teacher in the early and late hours of the center day.

- - - all centers at times supplement their core staff with part-time assistants, volunteers, and/or student interns. This manpower pool, not included in our calculations, tends to reduce the number of children per available adult.

- - - our calculations were limited to classroom staff and excluded administrative personnel. However, nearly all administrators indicated that they take on some classroom duties during staff absences.

None of the three infant centers we contacted had any children below six weeks of age, nor did they plan to serve that population. Their ratios, for infants and toddlers aged four months to two-and-a-half years, ranged between 2.3 and three children per adult, and easily met both federal and state demands. The two after-school programs, with ratios of ten children per adult, were also in compliance.

F. Male Teachers

Since many of the children enrolled in the programs are assumed to come from households headed by women, the presence of male teachers to provide a positive role-model is believed to be desirable. The nurture of young children in our society has traditionally

been perceived as "women's work" and until recently had not attracted men. Low pay for day care workers limits the number of men going into the field, but we found some evidence of men beginning to break into day care. In the thirty centers from which we were able to obtain this information, fifteen reported at least one male teacher on the staff.

G. Staff Turnover

Staff turnover is an enormous problem in the delivery of good day care services, not only for the center management, but for the children in their care. A continual stream of transient caregivers means that the children must constantly make emotional adjustments to new sets of "significant others." Their need for a relationship of trust in a parent surrogate figure is interrupted all too frequently, perhaps not to take hold again.

These traumas seem to be insufficiently appreciated by many center directors, whose discussions about staff turnover are limited to a recital of the administrative difficulties involved in recruitment and training of new people. A young child at a center is called upon to relate every day to as many as fifty persons, and quite a few of these are transient faces - new volunteers, new classmates, new trainees from a federal manpower program, new students there for a brief internship, observers from Trenton or Washington and new staff members. The youngster needs at least one quasi-permanent connection of trust to help him navigate through this vast sea of ephemeral relationships. Frequent change in the primary caregiver is probably the most dangerous emotional hazard associated with surrogate child care.

Eighty-four per cent of the centers we visited had had some changes in their teaching staff within the past year.

This turnover activity took place during a year of high unemployment and limited opportunities for job changes, and may well be more extensive during periods of economic upturn.

H. Teaching Methodology

We asked the directors about their approaches to teaching cognitive, social and motor skills to the children. Basically, we wanted to learn whether the educators in charge see this function as one to be fostered in some systematic fashion through daily exercises, or whether it is to be diffused in a less structured general curriculum.

In our sample, the responses were divided evenly: sixteen centers favor a fairly systematic approach to the imparting of skills (especially in the area of cognition) and sixteen centers prefer a more informal, less concentrated teaching style.

In this area also, we found that the theoretical disputes that rage in the academic literature of early childhood education have no counterpart in the day-to-day service delivery. Except for the two Montessori centers in our sample, the programs had no specific pedagogic orientation. Even the Montessori schools were far from fanatical in their outlook, apparently ready to modify theory to fit the demands of practice.

Only one non-Montessori program director stated any kind of commitment to an academic point-of-view, that of Jean Piaget. In general, any mention of a leading school of pedagogy - whether Piaget, Rousseau, Froebel, John Dewey, Engleman-Bereiter - brought forth a quizzical look, as though the directors did not recall or did not care about these fine points, so divorced from practice. The only bit of professional jargon that was thrown around a great deal was talk about the "open classroom" - with everybody all

for it.

I. Availability of Television

Half the centers we visited had use of a television set at the site. In the facilities where television was available, the directors were quick to say that the use of it was tightly controlled, essentially limited to watching *Sesame Street*. However, while one director was giving us this information, a group of four-year-olds were observed in the next room quietly watching *Happy Days* on a huge color set, a situation-comedy about teenage shenanigans in the 1950s.

In three other centers we saw staff members watching adult shows, twice during the children's rest period and once while the youngsters were engaged in more suitable activities nearby, under the guidance of another teacher.

J. Relationship with DYFS

We tried to get some notion of the quality of the relationships between the centers and DYFS. The Division serves as the fiscal agent for the disbursement of federal and local-match funds for community Title XX day care and is administratively responsible for the operations of subsidized day care in New Jersey. It had been much maligned at public hearings in early 1975 by various day care constituencies and was being subjected to public attacks at the time of our visits.

The center directors were uneasy with the subject and suspicious about the use we might make of their answers to these inquiries. Their views, pronounced with many qualifiers, tabulate as follows: at the twenty-seven centers to which the question applies (two centers are not funded through the DYFS, and three are operated by the Division itself) five directors implied that relations were poor or deteriorating, while twenty-two stated that relations were good or at least improving.

The cumulative impression of the answers - some of them so cautious as to be unhelpful - is one of improving relationships, and of apparent good will on the part of the Division's leadership toward community-run centers. One director in particular stated that things were much better under Commissioner Klein and Division Director Kagen, that both are interested and concerned. Several centers previously operating without the assistance of Title XX (before that, Title IVA) money and quite new to the fold of recipient agencies were especially lavish in their praise for the Division, the field staff of the Bureau of Day Care, and the whole Title XX operation, which had brought greater stability and comfort to their centers.

K. Payment Delays

Delays in getting reimbursements for operating expenses have been a sore point in the relationship between the state agency and the individual centers. Stories circulate about centers that have to borrow money commercially in order to meet their payrolls and other obligations. We tried to find out how widespread this practice has been.

In the twenty-seven centers where the question was applicable, fifteen claimed that they had had to take out commercial loans at least once. Twelve stated that they had never been put in that position. However, several directors of programs that have not borrowed money emphasized that payments had been dangerously late at times and that the only reason they were able to avoid commercial borrowing was because their day care operations are part of multi-service agencies that receive money from other sources and helped out by temporarily juggling accounts.

L. Background of Children in Center Programs

We attempted to learn in greater detail something about the socio-economic background of the children enrolled in the Title XX centers.

Our questions on this subject were greeted with inarticulate responses and a notable reluctance to provide information. It is obviously an area about which the directors are sensitive, perhaps out of a desire to protect the children from curiosity, or out of fear that the answers may label the center in some unfavorable way. A few had pertinent facts seemingly at their fingertips; most directors claimed that they could not provide us with data, such as the number of children from single-parent households, without spending a great deal of time gathering such information.

What we came up with were answers to a few generalized questions, such as "are most of the mothers of the enrolled children working?" to which we received the reply that most mothers were either employed or "doing something" — like going to school or taking a manpower training course.

For what it's worth, we obtained the following picture on the background of the centers' user population:

"Most children are from families on welfare"	10 centers
"Most children are from single-parent families"	23 centers
"Most mothers are employed, in school or training"	23 centers
"Most children are from small families"	22 centers

From this sketchy information we derive the impression that the centers tend to serve families on welfare (some of the centers had nearly a one hundred per cent enrollment of families on full or supplemental welfare, and even those that did not report a majority of welfare clients served many welfare families); that the children are there primarily because the mother is involved full-time in another pursuit outside the home; and finally, that though coming from a sector of society traditionally associated with large families, these children tend to come from relatively small families.

M. A Range of Comments on Various Concerns

In the course of our far-ranging discussions, directors expressed their views on many other pertinent subjects. Some of their comments:

On fees to parents:

"I will not collect a dime under Title XX or any other Title. I would rather put a lock on the door."

"I definitely feel parents should pay fees. It makes people more responsible."

"If you give something away for free I think it is bad psychology. I would like to see them give a dollar rather than nothing. Not paying affects parental involvement in the program in a negative way."

"It is terrible not to have a fee schedule! It takes away a certain amount of pride from the parents."

"Fees should not be charged. We are here to serve those who cannot pay."

"Parents should pay fees. Unfortunately, in this society, what you don't pay for is valued very little."

"Last year the parents paid a fee. Now, under Title XX, it has been cut out. Even

the parents grumbled. They now have a petition hanging on the front door signed by a lot of parents to reintroduce the fee."

On Day Care Staff

"I am concerned about members of my staff being so involved with union business. A former staff person was very active and did not seem too concerned with center work."

"Jobs are difficult to get and people are happy to get whatever is available. We screen applicants thoroughly and we recruit only loving and patient people."

"There is chronic absenteeism amongst the staff. They have no sense of responsibility. The job comes second. They have no motivation. They bring their personal problems to work."

"There is high turnover in supervisors because there is no room for advancement."

"The worst problem is trying to get staff, trying to get them to make decisions in favor of the children. When one of the teachers was fired the board was very sympathetic. Some teachers spank a child -- that is equal to child abuse. They put a child in the closet or take his snack away; that is certainly grounds for censure."

On Parental Participation

"There is very little response to our workshops."

"The parents are not represented on the board because they are too transient."

"Our parent group is very active. They act as volunteers when the staff has meetings. They now buy the food, the rationale being that mothers try and get the best value for their children. The parents feel very close to the center."

"With some pressure, we get a good turnout at the four meetings we have per year. The parents depend upon the teachers as authority in education and as their friend."

"There should be parent participation but there is no magic in it. Parents are not at all concerned about what the program has to offer. When they come in they want the center doors to be open, and the center to be warm, and when it is time to go they want to see them with their boots on. The parents are concerned with good custodial care, they want a safe place."

On Program Goals

"The kindergarten teachers don't want kids who read and write. They want kids who can put on their jackets and gloves."

"The children need to get a lot of discipline here since they do not get much at home."

"We help to cultivate in the children a measure of self-esteem and positive feelings about themselves."

"The children participate in art competitions and have won prizes. I feel that in the pre-school years the emphasis should be on creativity rather than on reading and writing."

On the Acceptance of Handicapped Children

"All centers should have some handicapped children; it is good for everybody."

"The school has no policy barring handicapped children who get on well with the other kids. But the teachers are regular teachers and are not equipped to handle them."

"We now have a definite policy against handicapped children, since there are too many schools that provide for them now."

"Our program is based on one-third enrollment of children with some learning and perceptual handicaps."

On Relations With DYFS

"The field coordinator is very good. She is always around."

"Field coordinators? You never see them!"

"Somehow, everything gets bogged down in bureaucratic trivialities and senselessness. There is a situation of crisis management and the children seem the last consideration."

"The DYFS does not consult persons in the grass roots of day care implementation."

"I feel sorry for the agency. They are run ragged in Newark. They are badly understaffed."

"They lack tact. We reported a suspected case of child abuse to the DYFS social worker. Rather than check into the situation discreetly they confronted the mother directly. This caused no end of trouble for us and worries about the child reporting the incident getting into more trouble at home."

N. Other Observations

A few other observations have impressed us as noteworthy in the context of this presentation:

--- Somehow, regardless of the time of our visits, the children seemed to be always eating or about to eat or just finished eating. Most centers serve two hot meals and two snacks; a few serve three snacks. The rites revolving around these repasts and the food consumption itself seem to take up an inordinate amount of time in the curriculum.

Thought should be given as to what constitutes a nutritionally and socially adequate feeding schedule, and at what point food becomes a keep-body entertainment item in the programs.

--- Though many directors complained about the difficulties they experience in raising their local match money, several stated that they were under pressure to spend money from unused funds available to DYFS for "one-shot" purchases which they did not need, or for which they could have spent far less money. Another director, who has been getting all the match money from the state so far, is facing an enormous increase in rate next year - a matter of \$5,000 to \$8,000. Since the center is already getting the maximum allowable reimbursement, one might expect that this would create great concern, but the director's total insouciance and relaxed confidence that the increase will be readily absorbed suggests an overly generous budget.

--- Generally, the centers were warm and pleasant places for the children. Even the most primitive and ill-suited physical plants managed to look cheerful. The over-all atmosphere seemed to be determined less by the concrete than by the personality and attitude of the director and the teachers. Many staff people seemed to have empathy for and understanding of the realities of the children's home life - in a touching display of indigenous cultural awareness, on one visit we were proudly introduced to a family of cockroaches fashioned by the little ones out of Play-Dough.

--- None of the centers maintained any systematic follow-up records on their graduates. Some directors had vague feedback from a few of the children, mostly relating to their initial adjustment to kindergarten. No attempt is being made to obtain information about the families or the children's later behavior. Without such data, over extended periods and from large population samples, we are condemned to remain ignorant about the full effects of day care, incapable of ever validating the numerous claims that are made for it as the ultimate prophylaxis against school failure, juvenile delinquency,

family breakdown and other social pathologies.

The utter void in follow-up information is presumably not caused by disinterest, but by a lack of funds with which to engage the staff needed. It seems a job worth doing, at least on a sample basis. Otherwise, day care will continue to survive on myths and hunches.

Summary of New Jersey Recommendations

In this section dealing with New Jersey's administration of day care programs we have, in passing, made a number of suggestions for improvement in operations. In the next section we will deal with broad proposals for change in day care policy. Therefore, we summarize the New Jersey proposals here, since they deal with specific programs in one state:

- - - In light of the experience with hurriedly launched day care programs, financial and performance accountability mechanisms should be brought up to the level required for DYFS to manage its programs, both old and new. Accounting for every dollar should be made a goal equal to capturing every dollar.

- - - Children in Title XX day care programs should not be abruptly removed when their family income passes the cut-off point (80 per cent of the state's median income). Instead, they should be allowed to remain until the family income exceeds 115 per cent of the state's median. A rising sliding-scale fee can be imposed between 80 and 115 per cent points.

- - - For similar reasons, the WIN day care centers should be converted to mixed centers, so that children do not have to be removed when their parents' training is completed. The end of WIN eligibility can be handled as a bookkeeping transfer and not a physical displacement of the child.

- - - Children living under home conditions that are hazardous to their well-being should have a priority on day care placements. Day care as a tool in casework management of multi-problem families is valid and should be given a more secure place in DYFS programs and policies.

- - - Delayed payments to day care centers cause unnecessary expense and hostility between DYFS and its service providers. There is no reason why sound bureaucratic practices cannot be installed to eliminate such frustrations.

- - - In establishing usage priorities for day care services, liberal arts college students should be given low priority and illegal aliens and foreign visitors should be excluded from subsidized programs.

Notes - Chapter 7

¹Testimony of James G. Kagen before New Jersey Assembly Institutions, Health and Welfare Committee, February 18, 1975 - Chart III.

²News Release, "Summary of DYFS Report," Office of Public Information, Department of Institutions and Agencies, December 13, 1975.

³Information from Peter Erwin, DYFS, Office of Budget and Fiscal Analysis.

⁴New Jersey Comprehensive Social Services Plan for FY '76, op. cit., p. iii.

⁵Statistical Abstract of the United States, p. 6.

⁶Source: New Jersey Health Department, Office of Public Health Statistics.

⁷The Star-Ledger, November 9, 1975.

⁸N.J. State Legislature, Office of Fiscal Affairs, Audit of Department of Institutions and Agencies, DYFS, January 20, 1976, p. 13.

⁹Audit report, p. 17.

¹⁰Department of Institutions and Agencies, DYFS, "Reply to Alleged Improper Management and Personnel Practices" Exhibit 6A, "Fiscal, Administrative and Support Services."

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid, Exhibit 6C.

¹³"Day Care in Vermont" (Excerpts from the Introduction and the Executive Summary) Child Care Bulletin Number 5, Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., Washington, D.C. p. 7, p. 6, p. 10.

¹⁴Interview with G. Bikales, April 9, 1976.

¹⁵The Star-Ledger, "Youth Agency Considers Cutting all But Crisis Aid," February 26, 1976.

¹⁶The Star-Ledger, "Deficit Threatens to Shut Youth Agency," April 26, 1976.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Testimony of Craig Salins, Public Hearings on Day Care Programs and Problems in New Jersey, February 19, 1975.

¹⁹Memo from Director James Kagen, "Center Day Care Expansion Plan Through June 1976", dated October 20, 1975.

²⁰Gwen Morgan to Robert Udell, "Comments on Proposed Rules and Regulations and Statute for New Jersey," dated December 16, 1974.

²¹Edna H. Hughes to Robert B. Udell, letter dated December 26, 1974.

Within Reason: A Policy For Day Care Programs

FOR MOST OF OUR history, the care of children during the workday was carried out within the family. The mother stayed home to care for the children while the father was at work. In special circumstances, there were exceptions. The very wealthy had their governesses. Foster parents and orphanages took care of children who had lost their parents. Day care centers were used to meet some transient needs of society -- to train the children of women working in sweat shops, to create jobs in time of depression, to free women for work in wartime. But these situations were recognized as unusual. The basic system of child care depended on motherhood within the family structure.

But, as we have seen, the family structure has been shaken by a battery of fundamental changes. Abortion, contraception, the emancipation of women, divorce, spiraling illegitimacy rates, the changing role of old people -- all of these have worked to transform the family structure. More and more women, either by choice or necessity, look for someone else to take care of their children during the workday. Day care programs have expanded to fill the growing demand for surrogate child-rearing. They have done so not because they are suited for the task but because they were there as a handy model of child safekeeping that could be expanded. Thus, a service intended to meet special, transient needs has been called upon to take a crucial, permanent place at the core of the American social structure.

The expansion of day care coincided with a great leap in the expectations of the American public - expectations for individual fulfillment and for the ability of collective programs to solve social problems. The classic venture designed to meet these expectations - the War on Poverty - invested much of its faith in a day care program, Operation Head Start.

Like many others of the poverty programs, Head Start was over-sold. Four-year-olds were demonstrably advanced by Head Start, but a few years later they seemed to have slipped back to become indistinguishable from their classmates who had had no head start. Either the permanence of Head Start training was overestimated or the ability of the school system to dull a child's mind has been underestimated. Despite the experience with Head Start, modern day care continues to be over-sold under the banner of "comprehensive developmental day care."

It is easy to believe that day care has unlimited possibilities for correcting the ills of society, just as it was once easy to believe that nearly universal literacy would produce an enlightened populace. One visit to a day care center may be all that is required. There, the sight of children busily learning or playing, guided by attentive, trained adults, generates visions laden with hope - the welfare cycle broken, the drop-out problem gone, mothers freed for fulfilling work, family strife overcome. Unlimited day care will provide unlimited benefits.

But as we have shown, the benefits of day care are severely limited. Many of them are unproven or transitory. The day care center can serve as a substitute for parental care in special circumstances, as it has in the past. But there are limits on what it can be asked to do, and these must be recognized. Stripped of rhetorical sugar-coating, universal day care would imply a decision to raise our children in institutions instead of families. That is a policy decision of vast import which lacks public acceptance at the moment.

Thus, as a first principle of policy, we believe:

Day care programs should be limited to deal with specific problems and clientele. They should not be universal, and rhetoric to that effect should be removed from legislation and guidelines.

CENTRAL TO ANY DISCUSSION of day care policy is the problem of cost in government-subsidized programs. Saving money in the operation of day care programs cannot be justified merely on the principle that a taxpayer and his money shall never be parted. There would be no sense in eliminating a sandbox at a day care center to save enough money for a taxpayer to buy a sand wedge for his next golf outing. On the other hand, it is foolish and unjust to take from one taxpayer the money that would send his own child to college in order to purchase day care services for someone else's child.

The question of how many dollars that might pay for college education can be siphoned off into day care subsidies is pertinent in discussing future directions for day care programs. The hard fact is that comprehensive, developmental day care has a unit cost of \$3,000 a year or more - about the same as two years of post-high school education at a community college. With many interests competing for scarce tax dollars, choices have to be made. Looking over the educational spectrum, we have to carefully weigh the potential societal benefits of a year of day care versus those of two years of

career-oriented community college training. If our faith in the educational enterprise is such that we insist on both day care and college for all our children, we must give thought to what other public services we are ready to give up in their place.

Inevitably, high unit costs must restrict day care to a select clientele. There cannot be enough to go around. Some who need and deserve it will not be able to get it. It would be ironic indeed to deny the service to many who are deserving and needy in order to provide the select with expensive extras of doubtful value.

If the goal of comprehensive, developmental day care is retained, unit costs cannot be held to a tolerable level. In pursuit of comprehensiveness, an endless series of incremental improvements can be justified. If monthly visits from a nurse are helpful, why not weekly visits, or daily visits? If psychiatric consultation is desirable, wouldn't the services of a child psychiatrist be even better? And why not get an expert in abnormal child psychology? If a part-time social worker helps, wouldn't two full-time social workers be four times as good? And so on.

The developmental goal is another cost-inflation mechanism. The educational establishment is given to measuring developmental quality in terms of what it likes to call "inputs." Thus, a person with a teaching certificate is not as good a teacher of children as the same person would be with a certificate as a child development specialist. Naturally, the specialist is entitled to premium pay. Two specialists are better than one and three are better than two. This despite the evidence which fails to show that teachers teach any better with fancy certificates or that children learn any better when exposed to the full panoply of modern pedagogic techniques.

The usual alternative to "developmental" day care is "custodial" day care, normally dismissed with the adjective "mere" or the synonym "baby-sitting". But good custodial day care need not be devoid of developmental effects. In an atmosphere of good care and attention, children flourish; they learn and retain much that is valuable. They may never even realize that the considerate, competent person who tends to them lacks a certificate in the higher forms of pedagogy.

The doctrines underlying developmental day care ultimately lead to extension of the present school system to younger children - four-year-olds, three-year-olds, and maybe two-year-olds. If no change is made in the present kindergarten-through-twelfth-grade school system, this extension of developmental day care is, at the least, a huge waste of time, money and effort. At worst, it can make the critical early grades of school a repetitious bore for children who are now kept alert with the challenges of learning something new. We will have to know a lot more about the long-term effects of academic training of very young children before we are justified in reducing the starting age for school. It may be necessary to revise the entire course of study in the schools to rationalize developmental day care. From what we know now, such a fundamental change is not worth attempting.

Therefore, as a second principle of policy, we believe:

Day care programs should be limited to sound custodial care, to hold unit costs to reasonable levels. No effort to convert day care centers into schools for toddlers is justified now.

In DISCUSSING THE costs of day care, we have used no figures. We have not defined the cost of "sound custodial care" or "reasonable levels" for unit costs. We cannot do so and we know no one who can do so with precision.

For one thing, the costs of providing day care services are measured with the most inexact accounting methods. Because many day care programs include a muddle of mixed purposes, costs include expenditures which are not strictly attributable to "day care." Comprehensive developmental day care centers are the most extreme examples. Costs are run up not only for the care of children, but for education, job-creation programs, and public health services. Thus, good custodial day care might be provided for \$40 a week per child, but when education specialists, teacher trainees, nurses, dietitians, psychological counselors and other functionaries are loaded on to the cost, \$60 a week per child is not nearly enough.

Because most such "quality" day care centers are government-supported, little attention is paid to this mixing of functions. Regardless of the purpose, all of the money now comes from taxes. But when a parent must pay for the service, the allocation of costs becomes important. Private payments for day care services should not carry the burden of extending the public school system to the age of three, nor should they subsidize job-creation programs, or finance public health programs for children. A woman who pays for her children at a day care center must weigh the cost against the income she can earn in a job. If the cost is too high, she may have to stay home. She should not be forced to that decision simply because the cost has been inflated to create jobs for others who are providing unnecessary services at a day care center.

Proponents of subsidized day care have long talked about "integrated" centers. By this they mean centers which are integrated economically - including children of poor families attending on subsidy and those of middle-class families attending at the parents' expense. Integration is a worthwhile goal. It can help counteract trends toward social stratification in the nation. But the goal has largely been talk so far. It has not become reality because paying clients cannot carry the cost burdens of a subsidized day care center. Few families can afford \$100 or \$150 a week for day care. If day care center costs were based on real "day care," without having to carry the extra burden of education, health and manpower programs, then private-paying clients might be able to afford the service. Integrated centers could then become a reality.

Thus, day care costs should be measured at levels of reasonable staffing to provide sound custodial care. If the children are also to be given some pre-kindergarten schooling, that money should be provided from the regular sources of school funds - whether local property taxes, state taxes or federal aid. The community can decide whether it wants to spend a dollar on teaching algebra to high school pupils or teaching four-year-olds to add. Day care staff trainees, who serve as part of an effort to upgrade skills, should be paid from manpower training funds. Such programs should compete with other manpower training programs for tax funds. In that way, education and manpower programs will not be instituted under the guise of "day care."

"Sound custodial care" is still an uncertain standard. However, it is not some philosophic imponderable. In the vast experience of running day care programs around the nation, it should be possible to ascertain such a standard. It requires setting down the physical facilities and staffing requirements for running a proper center. They would

most likely approximate the requirements provided for in New Jersey's proposed new day care licensing law. They certainly would not include all the trappings demanded by the proponents of "quality comprehensive developmental day care." But they might reduce costs by perhaps a third. That would allow many more children into the programs, without added expenditure. And it would allow many middle-class families to put their children in subsidized day care programs and promote the goal of integrated centers.

Therefore, we recommend that:

Budgeting and accounting for day care programs include only funds for sound custodial care of children. Education, manpower training, public health and other functions carried out at day care centers should be financed from programs designed and labeled for those purposes.

IMPLIED IN THESE policy principles is the premise that a clear statement of the true costs of day care must be presented to the government and to paying clients. We believe that this is a necessity. Day care programs are not some preventive cure-all for the ills of society. They have limited benefits, and both government and private citizens should weigh those benefits against the real costs. They cannot do so if the programs are a *melange* of purposes, with the costs clouded by subsidy and muddy bookkeeping. The kind of budgeting we have suggested will make the costs of day care apparent to the government. To make those costs apparent to consumers other steps are necessary, however.

To the paying customer, the costs of day care are clear. They amount to so many dollars a week. A woman seeking to go to work can compare the day care bill against her paycheck and decide whether it is worth it. But to a woman on welfare, or entitled to subsidized day care for some other reason, no such weighing of costs is necessary or even possible. She can send her children to a day care center at no personal cost, while she takes a job that may pay \$100 a week or even while she enters a training program for a job that does not exist. Meanwhile the government may pay \$120 a week to care for the children she could tend better herself. In such circumstances, the mother may also become a staunch advocate of "quality" day care, supporting the most advanced and expensive developmental trappings for her day care center. The trappings are probably useless but they are "free." In fact they can be very costly. They may eat up the money that would allow some other woman and her children to benefit from day care.

The way to remedy this separation of the consumer from the cost is to subsidize day care through a voucher system. The day care indigent would be given a voucher which could be spent on day care services. The consumer could shop around and buy the service that suits the individual family, in terms of cost and quality. The voucher should be purchasable as food stamps are now. If taking care of a child at home during the day costs \$10 a week and a day care program costs \$30 a week, then a \$30 day care voucher should be purchasable for \$10 in welfare assistance money. The family can decide which way it wants to use the money. A center that provides more than custodial care and costs more than \$30 a week would require the family to dig deeper into its own funds. On the other hand, day care with a neighboring family may be fully covered by the subsidy. And the growth of informal networks of family day care homes may well be stimulated by

such a system. The purchase price of the voucher could be raised for those whose income qualifies them for only partial subsidy. Such a program would end the separation of the subsidized day care customer from the cost of the service. It would restore a healthy restraint on programs which have suffered too much from uninhibited claims and costs.

Therefore we recommend that:

Day care services for people who cannot afford to pay for them be subsidized through a voucher system, rather than direct subsidies to program operators.

BESIDES HOLDING COSTS in line, there are other ways in which we can make our day care investment go further. Our declining birth rate, for one, is already doing its share by extending available day care slots to cover a larger proportion of the potential clientele. But a rational system of priorities can assure that day care funds are spent where they really do the most good, and in furtherance of our other national goals. For example, children with handicaps and those threatened by gross neglect due to severe social problems in the home have a first call on some type of tax-supported services. The mother working as the sole support of a small family is another prime candidate for day care assistance. On the other hand, parents requesting day care to pursue full-time liberal arts studies should have very low priority. Visiting aliens and illegal immigrant should be excluded from subsidized services.

Thus, we further recommend that:

Priorities should be determined in the allotment of day care subsidies, to assure that they are used where they are likely to have the most beneficial impact upon families and upon society at-large.

As we have discussed, day care services come in a number of varieties, depending on the ages of the children involved. They are entitled to different degrees of government support. Infant day care is very expensive; during the period of a child's infancy it makes sense for the mother to take care of her children. Only in special cases does infant day care seem a reasonable venture for government. Such special cases would include certain handicapped children, abused and neglected children, and the children of teen-aged mothers who need to be in school.

Day care for pre-school children is the variety which is on the rise, without good reason. When decked out with developmental and comprehensive frills, it too can be very expensive. But as we have suggested, these pedagogical gew-gaws can be eliminated, reducing the cost, and if the customer is confronted directly with the bill, pre-school day care can be made a reasonable program used by those who need it and want it.

After-school day care is economical, if we resist the temptation to make it an extension of the school day. It should get a high priority rating. It is one day care service that should be expanded to meet demand, for it can help restore women to jobs and careers during the twelve years that children spend in schools.

Therefore we recommend that:

After-school day care be given top priority for expansion. Pre-school day care should be de-emphasized and trimmed to meet a demand based on the costs involved. Infant day care should be provided only in special circumstances.

THROUGHOUT THIS REPORT, we have noted a dearth of precise information on the costs and effects of day care programs. There is little excuse for this situation to exist after billions of dollars have been spent operating day care programs, many of them bearing the tag of "demonstration" programs. Unfortunately, most of the demonstrating has been aimed at showing how elaborate day care can be. It would be a worthwhile effort for the government, or charitable foundations, to conduct some demonstration programs to determine precise levels of sound custodial care and to gather information on the long-term effects of various day care experiences.

CONCLUSION

WE HAVE DISCUSSED day care not as a virtue unto itself, but as a service that can help in dealing with major social trends. It is not some social panacea that will cure social ills. As such it should not be expanded to become part of the universal experience of growing up - at least not until the nation decides that it wants to give up on the family.

Day care, then, is not entitled to unlimited support in pursuit of unlimited goals. It cannot produce unlimited benefits. And unless its unit costs are restrained, its clientele will be limited. Many families that should be able to benefit from day care services now cannot afford them. They are deprived of making important choices in how to live their lives.

In recent years, freedom of choice has been widened for many Americans - especially women. Motherhood has become almost a matter of choice, because of the availability of contraception and abortions and because of changing social attitudes toward the role of women. Day care can play an important role making this freedom of choice fair and honest. That is a lot to expect of a social service. It should not be asked to do more.

Appendix

Day Care Centers Visited in Connection With Survey

Ada Budrick Day Care Center
122 Plane Street
Bosnton, New Jersey

Babyland Nursery
755 South Orange Avenue
Newark, New Jersey

Better Beginnings Child Care Center
318 North Main Street
Hightstown, New Jersey

Bozarth Early Childhood Demonstration Project
Glassboro State College
Glassboro, New Jersey

Burlington County Day Care Center
Camden and Pleasant Valley Avenue
Moorestown, New Jersey

CHEN Day Care Center
c/o YM-YWCA
Broad Street
Newark, New Jersey

Collinsville Child Care Center
125 South Street
Morristown, New Jersey

Day Care of Bloomfield and Glen Ridge
224 Broad Street
Bloomfield, New Jersey

The Early Learning Center
1 Church Street
Teaneck, New Jersey

Egenoif Day Nursery
725 Newark Avenue
Elizabeth, New Jersey

El Centro Communal Borincano
617 North 2nd Street
Camden, New Jersey

Essex Unit - National Association for Retarded Children
62 North Walnut Avenue
East Orange, New Jersey

Flemington Day Care Center
Main Street and Maple Avenue
Flemington, New Jersey

Glassboro Child Development Center
306 University Boulevard
Glassboro, New Jersey

Grand Street Day Care Center
525-529 Grand Street
Jersey City, New Jersey

Greater New Brunswick Day Care Council
120 Livingston Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Hilary School
427 South 17 Street
Newark, New Jersey

Industry Community Center
130 Trumbull Street
Elizabeth, New Jersey

Latin-American Day Care Center
37-39 Mill Street
Paterson, New Jersey

Madison Day Care Center
4 Madison Avenue
Madison, New Jersey

Mill Hill Infant Center
189 South Broad Street
Trenton, New Jersey

Neighborhood House Association
12 Flagler Street
Morristown, New Jersey

Perth Amboy Day Care 100
777 Cortland Street
Perth Amboy, New Jersey

DAY CARE

125

Princeton Nursery School
78 Leigh Avenue
Princeton, New Jersey

Princeton YWCA After School
Avalon Place
Princeton, New Jersey

Salvation Army
45 Spring Street
Morristown, New Jersey

United Cerebral Palsy Association of Middlesex County
Roosevelt Park
Edison, New Jersey

United Methodist Church
50 Park Place
Morristown, New Jersey

University NOW
171 Broadmead Street
Princeton, New Jersey

Walnut Avenue Day Care Center
139 Walnut Avenue
Trenton, New Jersey

Woodstown Day Care Center
Presbyterian Church
Auburn Avenue
Woodstown, New Jersey

Centers contacted that refused to be included in survey:

Child Development Center of North Ward Educational and Cultural Center
346 Mount Prospect Avenue
Newark, New Jersey

Tri-Cities Union for Progress
675-681 South 19 Street
Newark, New Jersey